

July 18, 2005

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, Room 383
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

Subject: **WEST CREEK PROJECT ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL
ANAYLSIS (WATER SUPPLY/WESTERN SPADEFOOT TOAD):**

GENERAL/SUB-PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 98-005-(5)

ZONE CHANGE NO. 98-008-(5)

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 98-005-(5)

OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 98-005-(5)

PARKING PERMIT NO. 98-005-(5)

VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 52455

FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE BOARD:

1. Close the public hearing, recertify the West Creek Final EIR, and the Final Additional Analysis (March 2005), as revised by the Final "Supplement Regarding Water Supplies" (July 2005), and readopt CEQA environmental findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations and Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan, as revised.
2. Adopt the attached resolution, ordinance, findings and conditions of approval reinstating the West Creek project approvals.

BACKGROUND

On March 22, 2005, the Board of Supervisors certified the original West Creek EIR and Final Additional Analysis and found that the documents had been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In April 2005, prior to reinstating the project approvals and after the Board of Supervisors' certification decision, Valencia Water Company (the project's retail water purveyor) confirmed the detection of perchlorate in Valencia's Well Q2, an alluvial well, in conjunction with

regular monitoring of active wells near the Whittaker-Bermite facility. Based upon this detection, a Supplement to the certified West Creek Final EIR and Final Additional Analysis was prepared to assess the Well Q2 information that became known only after the Board's certification decision. This Supplement was made available for public review and comment between May 18, 2005 and July 1, 2005 (45 days). The County has prepared written responses to public comments received on the Supplement, and a Final Supplement has been prepared for the Board's consideration.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The West Creek EIR and Final Additional Analysis, as revised by the Supplement, discloses the detection of perchlorate in municipal-supply wells in both the Saugus Formation and the Alluvial aquifer. Recent technical data presented in the West Creek Final Additional Analysis also acknowledged that some potential risk existed to other down gradient Alluvial aquifer wells in proximity to the former Whittaker-Bermite site. In light of that risk, Valencia Water Company had been planning for some time to be in a position to respond to other Alluvial wells impacted by perchlorate contamination through installation of ion exchange wellhead treatment, which is specially designed for the selective removal of perchlorate from potable water, and, as such, has been approved for potable water use for drinking water system components at several locations in California.

The West Creek EIR and Final Additional Analysis, as revised by the Supplement, also discloses that, according to Castaic Lake Water Agency (CLWA), Valencia and other retail purveyors, adequate water supplies exist to serve existing users, the West Creek project at the time of need (2007 and beyond), in conjunction with other cumulative development in the Valley. CLWA, Valencia and other retail purveyors have further advised the County that there is sufficient well capacity in uncontaminated portions of both the Saugus Formation and the Alluvial aquifer to pump the volumes of groundwater shown in the Final Additional Analysis, which is based on the annual Santa Clarita Valley Water Reports, the 2000 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), as amended, and other supporting documents even without Well Q2. Additionally, the detection of perchlorate at Well Q2 is consistent with the groundwater flow modeling information previously presented to the County Board of Supervisors, and the Saugus and Alluvial municipal-supply wells where perchlorate has been detected, including Valencia's Well Q2, are still capable of being used as part of a viable water supply over the long term,

because the water is treatable through proven ion exchange technology already in use in California and elsewhere.

Construction of the wellhead treatment system on Valencia's proposed site will not create any significant impacts to the environment. The wellhead treatment system would be constructed at a location already developed with commercial uses, immediately adjacent to the existing Well Q2, outside of both the Santa Clara River and the 100-year floodplain. No waste brine would be created by the treatment process and all used resin would be disposed of in permitted off-site locations.

Funding for the wellhead treatment of Well Q2 has been secured by Valencia and, therefore, such treatment is considered economically feasible. The wellhead treatment of Well Q2 is expected to be in place in late 2005. This time frame is well before the West Creek project is anticipated to be constructed and occupied.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The West Creek EIR and Final Additional Analysis, as revised by the Supplement, responds to the water supply issues specified by the Court, the Valencia Well Q2 information, and the project's impacts on the western spadefoot toad.

The Final Supplement (July 2005) is attached for your review and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
James E. Hartl, AICP, Director of Planning

Frank Meneses, Acting Administrator
Current Planning Division

Attachments: West Creek Final Supplement (July 2005)
West Creek Draft Supplement (May 2005)
Revised Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
Revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan
Board Resolution, Ordinance, Findings and Conditions of Approval Re:
General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendment

Zone Change No. 98-008-(5)
Conditional Use Permit No. 98-008-(5)
Oak Tree Permit No. 98-008-(5)
Parking Permit No. 98-008-(5)
Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 52455

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
REGARDING THE WEST CREEK PROJECT**

Los Angeles County Project No. 98-008-(5)

consisting of:

General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendment No. 98-008-(5)

Zone Change No. 98-008-(5)

Conditional Use Permit No. 98-008-(5)

Oak Tree Permit No. 98-008-(5)

Parking Permit No. 98-008-(5)

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 52455

State Clearinghouse No. 1998021052

(for environmental document)

County of Los Angeles

Board of Supervisors

500 West Temple Street

Los Angeles, California 90012

July 2005

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE WEST CREEK PROJECT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board") hereby certifies the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the West Creek project, as revised by the West Creek Final Additional Analysis and Supplement (as defined below). This certification is made in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") (Public Resources Code §§21000 *et seq.*), the state CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal.Code Regs. §§15000 *et seq.*) and the trial court's writ of mandate, dated June 27, 2003 (on remand), in response to the published Court of Appeal decision in the West Creek litigation (*Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment, et al. v. County of Los Angeles* (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 715).¹

The Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Department") caused the West Creek Final Additional Analysis to be prepared in response to the trial court's writ of mandate issued in the West Creek litigation. Specifically, the trial court's writ directed that the County revise the water supply analysis in the original West Creek EIR to address the issues raised in the published Court of Appeal decision and the trial court's subsequent writ.²

In summary, the Court of Appeal in the West Creek litigation found that the West Creek EIR's cumulative impact water resource analysis did not adequately disclose the actual amount of water that the State Water Project ("SWP") can deliver to local water wholesaler, Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA"), in wet, average and drought years, and failed to discuss or analyze whether there are any differences between entitlement to SWP water and actual availability of supplies of that water. Thereafter, the trial court (on remand) issued its writ ordering the County to void its certification of the West Creek EIR and prepare revisions to that EIR, in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the Court of Appeal decision and the trial court's writ. The trial court also suspended the West Creek project approvals (defined below), pending the Board's certification of the revised environmental documentation for the West Creek project.

The Final Additional Analysis completely revised the water service section of the original West Creek EIR. The Final Additional Analysis serves as the CEQA document required to meet the court direction to revise and reassess the cumulative impacts analysis for water supply and demand, and any analysis contained in that EIR "related to" water supply and demand.

¹ For a copy of the trial court's peremptory writ of mandate in the West Creek litigation, please see Appendix A to the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Vol. I (December 2003).

² For a copy of the published opinion in the West Creek litigation, please see Appendix A to the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Vol. IV (April 2004).

In addition, an augmented environmental analysis ("AEA Spadefoot") was prepared at the direction of the Department to address the confirmed discovery of the western spadefoot toad on the West Creek project site. The western spadefoot toad was discovered on the West Creek site after the County already circulated for public review and comment the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, which was limited to addressing the water supply and demand issues of the West Creek project in response to the court decision in the West Creek litigation.

The AEA Spadefoot was contained in the document entitled, "A Component of the Draft Additional Analysis to the West Creek EIR," Volume V (June 2004). The AEA Spadefoot was circulated for public review and comment for the 45-day period required under CEQA. In addition, the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") held an additional public hearing on the AEA Spadefoot on August 11, 2004. All written and oral comments and responses to those comments on the AEA Spadefoot have been included in the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Volume VI (September 2004).

On March 22, 2005, after the close of the public hearing, the Board certified the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Draft and Final Additional Analysis, adopted the revised CEQA "Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding the West Creek Project" (March 2005) and the revised Mitigation Monitoring Plan ("Mitigation Monitoring Program"). In doing so, the Board indicated its intent to reinstate and reaffirm the previously adopted project approvals (defined below), and instructed County Counsel to prepare the necessary resolution, ordinance, findings and conditions of approval.

After the Board's certification of the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Draft and Final Additional Analysis on March 22, 2005, and before the Board acted to reinstate and reaffirm the previously adopted project approvals, the project applicant advised the Department and its Board that Valencia Water Company, the local retail water purveyor for the West Creek project, had confirmed the detection of perchlorate in Valencia's Well Q2. Well Q2 is an Alluvial aquifer municipal-supply well, located near the former Whittaker-Bermite facility.

In response to that information, the Department caused to be prepared the Supplement to the West Creek EIR and Final Additional Analysis (SCH No. 1998021052) ("Supplement"). The Supplement documents the determinations made by the Department regarding the detection of perchlorate in Valencia's Well Q2, an Alluvial aquifer municipal-supply well, located near the former Whittaker-Bermite site.

B. PROJECT APPROVALS

The project approvals that have been granted for the West Creek project were suspended pending the County's certification of the revised West Creek environmental documentation. The project approvals that were granted, but suspended, are:

- (a) General Plan and Sub-Plan Amendment No. 98-008-(5);

- (b) Zone Change Case No. 98-008-(5);
- (c) Conditional Use Permit No. 98-008-(5) to authorize development of the site as a Residential Planned Development and Neighborhood Business Zone, development in a Hillside Management Area, development in an SEA, and to permit the use of commercially designated property for residential uses;
- (d) Oak Tree Permit No. 98-008-(5) to authorize removal of 13 oak trees;
- (e) Parking Permit No. 98-008-(5) for off-site and reciprocal parking; and
- (f) Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 52455 (collectively, "Project Approvals").

The Board hereby certifies the adequacy of the original West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and the Supplement (as defined below), and, by doing so, reinstates and reaffirms the previously adopted Project Approvals for the West Creek project, with the modifications to the previously adopted water service and environmental findings as set forth herein.

C. WEST CREEK FINAL ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS AND SUPPLEMENT

The West Creek Final Additional Analysis consists of the following additional environmental documents to the original West Creek EIR (collectively, "Final Additional Analysis"):

- (a) Draft Additional Analysis, Volume I (Text, Figures/Tables, Appendices) and Volume II (Appendices), dated December 2003;
- (b) Final Additional Analysis, Volume III (Comments and Responses, *etc.*) and Volume IV (Appendices), dated April 2004;
- (c) A Component of the Draft Additional Analysis to the West Creek EIR (AEA Spadefoot), Volume V, dated June 2004;
- (d) Final Additional Analysis, Volume VI, dated September 2004;
- (e) Final Additional Analysis, Volume VII, dated March 2005; and
- (f) Revised Additional Analysis, Volume VIII, dated April 2005.

The Supplement to the West Creek EIR and Final Additional Analysis consists of: (a) the draft Supplement, Volume I (May 2005), including all appendices; and (b) the Final Supplement, Volume II (July 2005), including public comments, responses to comments and additional appendices (collectively, "Supplement").

The Board finds that the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement, has been completed in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, the County's Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, the Court of Appeal's decision and trial court's writ (on remand). The Board further finds that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the following documents:

- (a) The West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement;
- (b) Los Angeles County staff reports and related documents;
- (c) The testimony and submissions from officials and departments of the County, the applicant, the public, public agencies, community groups, organizations and individuals; and
- (d) The West Creek record of proceedings (as defined below).

Concurrently with the adoption of these findings, the Board has reviewed and considered the revised Mitigation Monitoring Program for the West Creek project, and finds that the revised Mitigation Monitoring Program has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

D. WEST CREEK RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The West Creek record of proceedings is specified below. The custodian of the West Creek record is the Department, the Department of Public Works, and the County's environmental consultant for this project, Impact Sciences, Inc. The West Creek record shall include, but is not limited to:

- (a) The original West Creek Draft and Final EIR (except with respect to the water resource/service section, which was revised and replaced by the West Creek Final Additional Analysis), including all appendices, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in those EIRs;
- (b) The Final Additional Analysis, including all appendices, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in that document;
- (c) The Supplement, including all appendices, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in that document;
- (d) All reports, project application materials, memoranda, maps, letters, and other planning documents, including attachments, related documents, and all documents cited, incorporated by reference or relied on in those materials, prepared by the EIR consultant, the project applicant, and the Department staff relating to the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement;
- (e) All staff reports, attachments and related documents, prepared by the Department relating to the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement;
- (f) Any minutes and transcripts of all public meetings and public hearings held by the Commission relating to the Final Additional Analysis;
- (g) All notices issued by the County to comply with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines or any other law governing the processing of the West Creek project;

- (h) Matters of common knowledge to the County, which include, but are not limited to: (i) Los Angeles County General Plan; (ii) Santa Clarita Valley Areawide Plan; and (iii) Los Angeles County Subdivision Code (Title 21) and Zoning Code (Title 22), as amended;
- (i) The documentation of the final decisions made by the Commission and Board relating to the original West Creek EIR, the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement;
- (j) Portions of the prior West Creek Administrative Record that the County deems relevant in its consideration of the West Creek project;
- (k) The Santa Clarita Valley Water Reports that have been issued annually from 1999 through 2004;
- (l) The 2000 Urban Water Management Plan (2000 UWMP), including the "Groundwater Perchlorate Contamination Amendment and Other Amendments" ("Amended 2000 UWMP");
- (m) The appendices and technical reports to the 2000 UWMP and the Amended 2000 UWMP, including, specifically, the CH2MHill *Regional Groundwater Flow Model for the Santa Clarita Valley: Model Development and Calibration* (April 2004) and the CH2MHill *Analysis of Perchlorate Containment in Groundwater Near the Whittaker-Bermite Property, Santa Clarita California* (December 2004); and
- (n) Any other written materials relevant to the Department's compliance with CEQA, and this Board's decision on the proposed West Creek project, including documents that have been released for public review, and reports, studies or other documents relied on in any environmental documentation prepared for the West Creek project and either made available to the public during the public review period, or included in the files of the Department or the Department of Public Works.

Having considered the foregoing record of proceedings, the Board makes findings pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, and Sections 15091 and 15092 of the CEQA Guidelines.

II. BACKGROUND

A. PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Valencia Company in conjunction with The Newhall Land and Farming Company is the project applicant for the West Creek project ("applicant").

The West Creek project site is located west of McBean Parkway, along the west bank of San Francisquito Creek, and north of Decoro Drive, bisected by Copper Hill Drive. The site is approximately 966 acres in size and generally undeveloped, although certain components of the project already have been constructed pursuant to the previously granted approvals. They include the Decoro Bridge over the San

Francisquito Creek, buried bank stabilization along San Francisquito Creek and three internal streets. The internal streets provide access to the Rio Norte Junior High School, located on the West Creek site, and permitted by the school district under a separate approval. The Decoro Bridge and Rio Norte Junior High School opened in 2003.

The project approval consisted of a total of 2,545 residential units (1,806 single family and 739 multi-family), 180,000 square feet of commercial/institutional development (including a potential elementary school site), public and private recreational facilities and open space, including an approximately 15-acre public park, a multi-purpose trail along San Francisquito Creek and project-associated community facilities and infrastructure (e.g., major roads, paseos, debris inlets and water tanks).

Circulation will be provided by a series of private internal collector roadways that connect to the previously approved extension of Copper Hill Drive, a public street bisecting the site that represents the primary roadway providing ingress and egress to the project site. Secondary access is provided by Dickason Drive *via* Decoro Drive.

Surrounding land uses include existing residential and commercial/industrial development to the south, residential development under construction to the east along the east bank of San Francisquito Creek, an industrial complex presently under development to the west, and the Tesoro del Valle residential community presently under development to the north.

The western portion of the irregularly shaped project site is currently undeveloped hillsides, some of which have been modified from grading for fire access roads, installation and maintenance of Southern California Edison transmission line towers, and Metropolitan Water District water lines. The eastern portion of the project site is disturbed due to previous agricultural activities. In addition, Copper Hill Drive crosses through the property.

Subsequent to the Project Approvals, the following agency approvals must be obtained: a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region ("RWQCB"), a Section 1601/1603 permit of the State Fish & Game Code from the California Department of Fish and Game ("CDFG"); a Section 404 permit of the Federal Clean Water Act from the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers ("ACOE"); and various permits for air emissions regulations found in the Air Quality Management Plan of the South Coast Air Quality Management District ("SCAQMD").

B. PRIOR COMMISSION/BOARD ACTIONS

The Commission conducted public hearings on the original West Creek EIR and the Project Approvals on June 16, 1999, August 23, 1999 and October 4, 1999, before recommending approval of the West Creek project on May 24, 2000.

On September 26, 2000, the Board certified the adequacy of the West Creek EIR and adopted the Project Approvals for the West Creek project.

On December 19, 2000, the Board adopted the final resolution, findings, conditions of approval, CEQA findings and statement of overriding considerations for the West Creek project. Thereafter, as discussed below, two environmental groups challenged the Board's actions in the West Creek litigation (*Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment, et al. v. County of Los Angeles*, Case No. 1043805).

C. LITIGATION BACKGROUND

The writ hearing was before the Honorable Thomas P. Anderle of the Santa Barbara County Superior Court. On January 10, 2002, Judge Anderle issued a Judgment in favor of the County and project applicant. An appeal followed.

On February 27, 2003, the Second District Court of Appeal, Division Six, reversed the trial court's judgment and remanded the matter for further proceedings consistent with its published opinion (*Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. County of Los Angeles* (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 715).

The Court of Appeal found that the West Creek EIR's cumulative impact analysis of water resources did not adequately disclose the actual amount of water that the SWP can deliver to the local water wholesaler, CLWA, in wet, average and drought years, and failed to discuss or analyze whether there are any differences between entitlement to SWP water and actual availability of supplies of that water.

The Court of Appeal observed that the EIR analyzed the cumulative impacts of past, present and future development on the amount of SWP water available by relying on SWP water entitlements in calculating the total available water supply, and criticized the EIR for failing to calculate, analyze or discuss the difference between entitlements and actual available supplies. The Court also stated that the EIR failed to respond adequately to comments about the reliability of delivery of SWP water. The Court found that rather than using estimates from the Department of Water Resources or other reliable sources as to the amount of SWP water that is actually available in wet, average and drought years, the EIR instead relied upon 100 percent of CLWA's entitlements in wet and average years, and 50 percent of its entitlements in drought years, without any substantial evidence supporting the validity of those percentages. It concluded that the EIR should have discussed the fact that entitlements of SWP water cannot be taken at face value, and should have provided reasoned analysis in response to comments raising this problem.

Because the water services portion of the EIR was found to be inadequate by the Court of Appeal, the trial court's earlier judgment was reversed, and the trial court was directed to issue a writ ordering the County to vacate certification of the EIR. The trial court was also directed to retain jurisdiction until the Department and its Board certified an EIR complying with CEQA consistent with the views expressed in the Court of Appeal's decision, and to consider such orders the trial court deemed appropriate under Section 21168.9 of Public Resources Code.

On June 27, 2003, in accordance with the Court of Appeal's instructions, the trial court vacated its prior judgment and issued a new judgment in favor of petitioners. The trial court also issued a writ ordering the County to vacate its certification of the West Creek EIR and to take further actions, consistent with the trial court's order, the provisions of CEQA and the views expressed by the Court of Appeal in its published opinion.

Specifically, the trial court's writ ordered the Department and this Board to revise the water services section of the EIR to include the analysis specified in the Court of Appeal's published decision, "including, at a minimum, accurate availability, reliability and supply estimates for State Water Project water in wet, average and dry years, which estimates must be obtained from the Department of Water Resources."³ The trial court directed that the Department and this Board "revise and re-assess the EIR's cumulative impacts analysis for water supply and demand, and . . . any and all analysis contained in the EIR related to water supply and demand." *Id.* The trial court further directed that the revised portions of the EIR be "re-circulated for public review and comment" and that adequate and detailed responses be prepared for such comments, "as required under Public Resources Code §21092.5 and consistent with the Court of Appeal decision in this case." *Id.* The trial court also directed that the Department and this Board "make clear in the revised analysis that State Water Project entitlements are not equivalent to actual deliveries of water." *Id.*

D. BOARD ACTION IN RESPONSE TO COURT DIRECTIONS

In response to the trial court's writ, and consistent with the Court of Appeal's published opinion, on August 19, 2003, the Board adopted a resolution to implement the trial court's directions.⁴ The Resolution directed the Department to take the necessary actions to address the issues specified by the Court, including the scheduling of hearings before the Commission and Board following completion of a revised environmental document. *Id.* The Resolution also suspended all project activity that could result in an adverse change or alteration to the physical environment, until the issues identified by the Court were fully addressed. *Id.* Finally, the Resolution required preparation of a revised environmental document addressing the specific water supply and demand issues presented in the Court of Appeal's published decision and the trial court's subsequent writ.

E. COUNTY PROCESSING/ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

On August 25, 2003, the Department caused to be prepared and submitted to responsible agencies and others the "Notice of Preparation of Additional Analysis for the

³ West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Vol. I (December 2003), Appendix A (trial court's "Peremptory Writ of Mandate," p. 2).

⁴ West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Vol. I (December 2003), Appendix B (Board Resolution).

West Creek Final Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 1998021052).⁵ On September 10, 2003, the Department conducted a public scoping meeting at the Bridgeport Elementary School in Valencia, California. No member of the public attended the scoping meeting. The Department received and considered two comment letters on the Notice of Preparation.⁶

From August through December 2003, the Department caused to be prepared the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Volumes I and II (December 2003). The Draft Additional Analysis contains the following sections necessary to make the prior West Creek EIR adequate under CEQA, the Court of Appeal decision and the trial court's writ:

- (a) Table of Contents, including a list of figures, tables and appendices;
- (b) Section 1.0, Introduction;
- (c) Section 2.0, Summary of Water Supply and Demand;
- (d) Section 3.0, Project Description;
- (e) Section 4.0, Water Service, which completely replaced the Water Service section of the prior West Creek EIR (prior Section 4.8) to respond to the Court of Appeal's decision and the trial court's writ of mandate. ;
- (f) Section 5.0, List of Preparers and Organizations and Persons Contacted;
- (g) Section 6.0, References; and appendices.

In December 2003, the Department published its Notice of Availability of the Draft Additional Analysis and filed a Notice of Completion with the Office of Planning and Research. The Notice of Availability (Notice) stated that the Draft Additional Analysis had been completed to respond to the issues specified in the trial court's writ and the Court of Appeal decision. The Notice also stated that copies of the West Creek EIR and the Draft Additional Analysis were available for public review at the County's Department of Regional Planning and at surrounding libraries.

The Draft Additional Analysis was circulated for public review and comment for the 45-day period required by CEQA, commencing on December 15, 2003 to January 28, 2004.

Specific to water supply and demand issues, the Draft Additional Analysis served as the CEQA document required to meet the Court's direction to evaluate the availability, reliability and supply estimates for SWP water in wet/average, dry and multiple-dry years using estimates obtained from the Department of Water Resources ("DWR"). Specifically, the Draft Additional Analysis: (a) used estimates from DWR to analyze the cumulative impacts of past, present and future development on the amount of SWP water available; (b) further calculated and analyzed the difference between

⁵ West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix C (Notice of Preparation).

⁶ West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Appendix C (Notice of Preparation/Comments on NOP).

SWP entitlements and actual available water supplies, and made it clear that SWP entitlements are not equivalent to actual deliveries of water; and (c) considered whether the revised analyses would affect the conclusions in the Final EIR concerning the significance of impacts related to water supply and demand.

In early 2004, the Department received, evaluated and responded to written and oral comments on the Draft Additional Analysis.⁷ In addition, the Commission held two public hearings on the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis on February 4, 2004 and April 14, 2004. At those hearings, the public was given additional opportunity to provide oral comments, which were transcribed, responded to, and included in the Final Additional Analysis.⁸

After circulation and public review of the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, the Department directed that all written and oral comments received on the document be compiled, along with other related documents, in the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Volumes III and IV (April 2004). Thereafter, an AEA Spadefoot was prepared at the direction of the Department to address the confirmed discovery of the western spadefoot toad on the West Creek project site. The AEA Spadefoot was contained in the document entitled, "A Component of the Draft Additional Analysis to the West Creek EIR," Volume V (June 2004).

The AEA Spadefoot was circulated for public review and comment for the 45-day period required under CEQA. In addition, the Commission held an additional public hearing on the AEA Spadefoot on August 11, 2004. All written and oral comments and responses to those comments on the AEA Spadefoot have been included in the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Volume VI (September 2004).

On September 15, 2004, the Commission recommended both certification of the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis, and adoption of the Project Approvals, with the modifications to the previously adopted water service and environmental findings discussed in the Commission's Resolution.

On October 26, 2004, the Board continued the public hearing regarding the West Creek revised environmental documentation and Project Approvals. On January 25, 2005, the Board held a public meeting on both the revised environmental documentation and the Project Approvals. At that meeting, the Board opened the public hearing, heard testimony for and against the project, and closed the public hearing as it related to any further public comments on the revised environmental documentation for the West Creek project. The Board also called for completion of all responses to public comments on the West Creek revised environmental documentation.

On March 22, 2005, the Board held a second public meeting regarding the West Creek revised environmental documentation and Project Approvals. Prior to that

⁷ West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Vols. III and IV (April 2004).

⁸ West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Vol. III (April 2004).

meeting, the Board received and reviewed the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Volume VII (March 2005).

After the close of the public hearing on March 22, 2005, the Board certified the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis, and adopted CEQA environmental findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring Program. In doing so, the Board indicated its intent to reinstate the previously adopted Project Approvals and instructed County Counsel to prepare the necessary resolution, ordinance, findings and conditions of approval.

F. SUPPLEMENT

After the Board's certification of the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Draft and Final Additional Analysis on March 22, 2005, and before the Board acted to reinstate and reaffirm the previously adopted Project Approvals, the project applicant advised the Department and this Board that Valencia Water Company had confirmed the detection of perchlorate in Valencia's Well Q2.

In response to that information, the Department caused to be prepared the Supplement to address the determinations made by the Department regarding the detection of perchlorate in Valencia's Well Q2.

The Department provided notice of availability of the Supplement to all public agencies, organizations and others on or about May 18, 2005, and caused the Supplement to be circulated for a 45-day public review and comment period, commencing May 18, 2005 to July 1, 2005. Thereafter, the Department caused to be prepared written responses to public comments on the environmental issues raised in the Supplement, and provided notice of the Board's public hearing scheduled for July 26, 2005.

At the hearing on July 26, 2005, the Board considered both the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement, and the reinstatement and reaffirmation of the previously adopted Project Approvals. The Board also considered the necessary resolution, ordinance, findings and conditions of approval relating to the previously adopted Project Approvals.

G. FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

The Board has received comments stating that "changed circumstances" have occurred or that "significant new information" has been presented, such that further environmental review is required in the form of a supplemental or subsequent EIR, in addition to the prior West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement. Based on the assessment presented in the Final Additional Analysis, Supplement and the entire record, the Board does not concur with these comments for the reasons stated below.

The Draft Additional Analysis was prepared in response to the Court of Appeal decision and subsequent trial court writ of mandate issued in the West Creek litigation.

The litigation made it clear that only the water services section of the West Creek EIR required revision, together with any analysis contained in that EIR "related to" water supply and demand.

Nevertheless, the Board has considered whether significant new information has been presented since completion of the West Creek EIR, as revised. The Board has determined, based on the entire record, that no new significant information has been presented, which would require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR, in addition to the prior West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement.

Under CEQA, new information is not considered "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that, absent recirculation, "deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement." See, CEQA Guidelines §15088.5; *Chaparral Greens v. City of Chula Vista* (1996) 50 Cal.App.4th 1134, 1146-1147. The Board has reviewed the original West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement, and has concluded that recirculation is not necessary because the CEQA threshold for recirculation has not been triggered. The criteria used by the Board determining that recirculation is not required are set forth below:

- (a) There are no new significant environmental impacts resulting from the West Creek project or from any proposed mitigation measures presented in the Final Additional Analysis or Supplement;
- (b) There are no substantial increases in the severity of any environmental impact noted in the Final Additional Analysis or Supplement; and
- (c) There are no feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures identified in the Final Additional Analysis or Supplement that would clearly lessen any significant environmental impact of the project, but that the applicant has declined to adopt. See, CEQA Guidelines §§15088.5(a), 15162(a)(3).

Accordingly, the Board has concluded that the correct "type" of document was prepared for the West Creek revised environmental documentation and that no further supplemental or subsequent EIR is required.

H. WATER SUPPLY AND DEMAND SUMMARY

The Draft Additional Analysis summarizes and assesses the water demand for the West Creek project in conjunction with the existing water demand in the Santa Clarita Valley, as well as the future cumulative water demand in the Santa Clarita Valley under near-term and long-term conditions.

In the West Creek litigation and the comments received on the NOP, questions have been raised regarding the reliability of water delivered by the SWP, the ability of

local water purveyors to deliver an adequate and reliable supply of water to its customers from all sources, and the extent to which ammonium perchlorate discovered in local groundwater reduces the amount of local groundwater available to the Santa Clarita Valley. The Final Additional Analysis provides a detailed discussion of these issues.

For example, the Draft Additional Analysis, Volume I, describes the existing water purveyors in the Santa Clarita Valley, the Valley's hydrological and topographical conditions, and drought effects in the Valley. The Analysis also provides in-depth information about water supplies and demand in the Santa Clarita Valley.

The Santa Clarita Valley water supplies come from imported SWP supplies, local groundwater supplies (Alluvial aquifer and Saugus Formation) and recycled water for non-potable purposes. The Draft Additional Analysis describes in detail these supply sources, and includes information on historical and current water conditions, groundwater levels, and water quality, specifically related to the detection of ammonium perchlorate in the Saugus Formation and Alluvial aquifer, provides a cumulative analysis of water demand, and includes a discussion of development of other supplies, for example, SWP turnback water pool project, carryover water, groundwater banking, water reclamation and water conservation.

The Draft Additional Analysis concludes that, in 2002, there were adequate and reliable supplies of water available in the Santa Clarita Valley to serve the existing population and to also supply water to the West Creek project.

Table 2.0-2 of the Draft Additional Analysis illustrates that actual supplies exceeded actual demand and that, even with adding the West Creek project water demand, there would still be excess supply.

In addition, the Draft Additional Analysis concludes that adequate and reliable supplies of water exist in the Santa Clarita Valley to serve the West Creek project and the existing and future population during future average, dry and critical dry years.

A modeling effort by DWR, the operator of the SWP system, indicates that 59 percent of SWP supplies can be delivered to SWP contractors in average years, 39 percent in dry years and 20 percent in critical dry years:

Total CLWA Contractual Table A Amount	95,200
Available in Average Year (59%)	56,073
Available in Dry Year (39%)	37,890
Available in Critical Dry Year (20%)	19,040

In 2003, DWR indicated that it expected to deliver 90 percent (or up to 3.71 million acre-feet) of the maximum contractual SWP Table A Amount to its SWP contractors. Ninety percent of CLWA's maximum SWP Table A Amount of 95,200 AFY is 85,680 acre-feet of water.

It should be noted that the above percentages for SWP water supplies in average, dry and multiple-dry years were based on DWR's DWRSIM modeling results, used to forecast CLWA SWP water supply under various meteorological conditions and regulatory constraints (see, West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Vol. I, Section 4.0, p. 4.0-77).

DWR has prepared a new computer model, known as CALSIM II. CALSIM II simulates the operation of the SWP on a monthly basis for a 73-year historical record of rainfall and runoff (1922-1994). When compared with DWRSIM, CALSIM II forecasts that more SWP water will be available in average years (*i.e.*, approximately 59 percent under DWRSIM versus 75 percent under CALSIM II), and less water will be available in a single critical dry years (*i.e.*, 39.8 percent under DWRSIM versus 20 percent under CALSIM II). Nevertheless, the analysis in the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, pp. 2.0-1-2.0-3, including Table 2.0-1, and p. 4.0-77, utilized a "worst case" approach for projecting SWP supplies in average years. To be conservative, the water analysis used the 59 percent projection (DWRSIM) for average year SWP deliveries rather than the 75 percent projection (CALSIM II).

The local water purveyor's ability to deliver adequate and reliable supplies of water to its customers is not adversely affected by the 1997 discovery of perchlorate in four Saugus Formation wells, the 2002 discovery of perchlorate contamination in an Alluvial aquifer municipal-supply well (Stadium well) or the 2005 discovery of perchlorate contamination in a second Alluvial aquifer municipal-supply well (Well Q2). The Final Additional Analysis and Supplement conclude that the detection of perchlorate has not limited the amount of water local purveyors have planned to deliver from the groundwater basin in the Santa Clarita Valley. All six of the impacted wells have been taken out of active water supply service. Despite the inactivated wells, the purveyors have advised the County that they have sufficient pumping capacity in other wells to meet the planned normal range of Alluvial and Saugus groundwater pumping from portions of the aquifers that have not been affected by the contamination. All other Alluvial and Saugus wells owned and operated by the purveyors are available for municipal water supply service. As part of regular purveyor operations, those wells are sampled on a regular basis and perchlorate has not been detected.

In addition, the Board has considered the updated perchlorate analysis presented in the: (a) West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Section 4.0; (b) Final Additional Analysis (including topical responses presenting updated information regarding perchlorate); and (c) Supplement. The Board has also considered: (a) the 2000 UWMP adopted by CLWA and the retail water purveyors in the Santa Clarita Valley (December 2000); (b) the Court of Appeal decision invalidating the 2000 UWMP on perchlorate grounds; and (c) the Amended 2000 UWMP, which was prepared in response to the Court of Appeal decision. Based on this information, the Board has determined that there are sufficient water supplies to serve the West Creek project, in conjunction with other planned and future development in the Santa Clarita Valley, because plans for the remediation of perchlorate detected in certain of the municipal

supply wells is substantially underway, and a schedule is in place for when remediation will be completed. In addition, based on the Supplement, the Board has determined that there are sufficient water supplies during the interim until remediation is completed, which is supported by the information presented in the Amended 2000 UWMP and the Supplement.

The following tables from the West Creek Final Additional Analysis present information showing that there are sufficient water supplies available to meet the water demand of the Santa Clarita Valley:

**Actual (2002) Plus Project Demand and Supply for the Santa Clarita Valley
(acre-feet per year)**

	2002 ^a
Actual 2002 Demand	68,225
Other Actual 2002 Demand (agricultural)	16,806
CLWA Plant Consumption/Metering ^b	707
Devil's Den Ranch ^b	2,737
Supply Banked in Semitropic Groundwater Bank ^c	24,000
Total 2002 Demand ^d	112,475
2002 Water Supply:	
Local Supplies	
Alluvial Aquifer	38,103
Saugus Formation	5,160
Imported Supplies	
2001 Carryover Water ^b	6,657
SWP Table A Amount	73,972
Subtotal	123,892
2002 Carryover to 2003 ^b	(4,760)
Total 2002 Supplies	119,132
2002 Surplus/(Deficit)	6,657
Less Projected West Creek (Dry Year) Demand ^d	(2,413)
Remaining Surplus After Subtracting Project Demand	4,244

^a Source: *Santa Clarita Valley Water Report 2002*, Prepared by the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District #36, Newhall County Water District, Valencia Water Company, April 2003. A copy of the Water Report is provided in Appendix E.

^b CLWA Plant Consumption/Metering demand represents an amount of water that is consumed by plant operations and metering; Devil's Den Ranch is owned by CLWA. This water demand is the amount of water that is used for agricultural irrigation on the Ranch if/when CLWA does not transfer the Ranch's water to the Santa Clarita Valley for domestic use; Carry over water is undelivered CLWA Table A Amounts from the prior year.

^c The amount of water CLWA placed in the Semitropic Groundwater Bank, located in Kern County.

^d Demand is increased by approximately 10% in dry years. 2002 was a dry year locally.

**Existing Plus Project Demand and Projected Supply for the Santa Clarita Valley
(acre-feet per year)**

	Average Year	Dry Year ^b	Critical Dry Year ^c
Existing Demand ^a	62,023	68,225	68,225
Other Demand (agricultural) ^a	15,278	16,806	16,806
West Creek Demand	2,194	2,413	2,413
Critical Dry Year 10% Demand Decrease (Conservation)			(8,744)
Total Demand	79,495	87,444	78,700
Existing Water Supply Programs Available:			
Local Supplies			
Alluvial Aquifer	35,000	35,000	35,000
Saugus Formation	11,000	13,000	15,000
Recycled Water	1,700	1,700	1,700
Imported Supplies ^b			
SWP Table A Amount	56,073	37,890	19,040
Semitropic Bank Account		7,200	7,200
Flexible Storage Account		1,561	1,561
Total Existing Supplies	103,773	96,351	79,501
Surplus/(Deficit)	24,278	8,907	801

^a Source: *Santa Clarita Valley Water Report 2002*, Prepared by the Castaic Lake Water Agency, Los Angeles County Waterworks District #36, Newhall County Water District, Valencia Water Company, April 2003. Based on the existing 2002 demand of 68,225 AF. A copy of the Water Report is provided in Appendix E.

^b Demand is increased by approximately 10% in dry years. 2002, the year from which this demand was derived, was a dry year and already reflects the 10% increase in demand over a normal or average year. A dry year is a year when below average rainfall occurs after a normal or wet year. CLWA and the retail purveyors have access to several other sources of water during dry years (e.g., SWP Turnback Water Pool Program, SWP Interruptible Water Program, DWR Dry Year Water Purchase Program, SWP Carryover Water, State Drought Water Bank, etc.) that can be used to enhance the reliability of supplies.

^c Demand in a critical dry year is expected to decrease by as much as 20% due to voluntary and mandatory planned purveyor conservation programs. This analysis assumes a critical dry year 10% reduction in demand from the dry year demand. A critical dry year is a year when rainfall is at a critically low level (i.e., a year that occurs once every 73 years). Such a demand reduction occurred in the last critical dry year experienced in the Santa Clarita Valley (1991).

**Average Water Year
Supply and Demand Assessment ^a
(acre-feet per year)**

	Year 2005	Year 2010	Year 2015	Year 2020
Existing Water Supply Programs Available				
Local Supplies				
Alluvial Aquifer	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
Saugus Formation	11,000	11,000	11,000	11,000
Recycled Water ^b	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
Imported Supplies				
SWP Table A Amount	56,073	56,073	56,073	56,073
Total Existing Supplies	103,773	103,773	103,773	103,773
Total Estimated Demand	81,700	90,100	100,700	113,100
Difference - Surplus/(Deficit)	22,073	13,673	3,073	(9,327)
Future Planned Water Supply Programs				
Local Supplies				
Recycled Water		9,000	14,000	17,000
Imported Supplies				
Water Transfers	5,200	5,200	5,200	5,200
Total Planned Supplies	5,200	14,200	19,200	22,200
Net Water Surplus/(Deficit)	27,273	27,873	22,273	12,873

^a Excerpted from Table 4-1 of the UWMP

^b 56,800 af represents approximately 59% of CLWA's contractual Table A amount. Normal year supply based on assumptions from the UWMP. The DWR SWP Delivery Reliability Report (2003) indicates greater reliability of Table A deliveries (72 to 76%) than was assumed for the 2000 UWMP.

**Dry-Year and Multi-Dry Year Water
Supply and Demand Assessment
(acre-feet per year)**

	Single Dry Year	Year 1	Multiple Dry Years Year 2	Year 3
Existing Water Supply Programs				
Local Supplies				
Alluvial Aquifer	35,000	32,500	32,500	32,500
Saugus Formation	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Recycled Water	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
Imported Supplies ^a				
SWP Table A Amount	19,040	37,890	37,890	37,890
Semitropic Bank Account	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
Flexible Storage Account	4,684	1,561	1,561	1,561
Total Existing Supplies	82,624	93,851	93,851	93,851
Total Estimated Demands	90,900	82,000	83,300	84,600
Voluntary 10% Conservation	(9,090)	(8,200)	(8,330)	(8,460)
Difference - Surplus/(Deficit)	814	11,851	10,551	9,251
Future Planned Water Supply Programs (2010)^b				
Local Supplies				
Recycled Water		7,300		
Saugus (New Wells)		20,000		
Imported Supplies				
Water Transfers		3,500		
Water Banking/Conjunctive Use		50,000		
Total Future Planned Supplies		80,800		

^a 19,040 represents 20% of CLWA's contractual Table A Amount. 37,890 AF represents 39.8% of CLWA's contractual Table A Amount. Dry year supply based on assumptions from the UWMP. The DWR SWP Delivery Reliability Report (2003) indicates greater reliability of Table A deliveries than was assumed for the 2000 UWMP.

^b The UWMP assumed a total of approximately 100,000 AF in available future supplies by 2020. Therefore, 50,000 AF shown herein is assumed to be available by 2010.

Scenario 2: Santa Clarita Valley 2025 Build-Out Scenario Water Demand and Supply
(acre-feet per year)

	Buildout (year 2020)		Buildout (year 2025)	
	Average Year	Dry Year	Average Year	Dry Year
Total Build-Out Demand ^b	113,100 ^a	124,410	123,176 ^c	135,494
Santa Clarita Valley Water Supplies ^d	129,328	228,745	132,899	221,467
Total	16,228	104,335^e	9,723	85,973^e

^a Source: 2000 UWMP, December 2000, Table 3-5 and the SB610 Water Supply Assessment for the West Creek project, 2003.

^b Demand is increased by approximately 10% in dry years.

^c Source: UWMP, December 2000, Table 3-5, using a straight-line projection from 2020 to 2025.

^d Source: UWMP, December 2000, Tables 2-2, 2-6 and 4-1.

^e Dry year supplies available above demand reflect water supplies that would be called upon by purveyors in dry years. Purveyors would typically secure water from these available supplies only in amounts necessary to meet demand. CLWA and the retail purveyors have access to several other sources of water during dry years (e.g., SWP Tumbuck Water Pool Program, SWP Interruptible Water Program, SWP Carryover Water, DWR Dry Year Water Purchase Program, etc.) that can be used to enhance the reliability of supplies.

III. SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES

Public comments have been received in response to the West Creek Final Additional Analysis to the original West Creek EIR, and Supplement. Presented below is a summary of the primary comments received, along with a summary of the responses to those comments.

A. RELIABILITY OF SWP SUPPLIES

Comments received have objected to the information presented in the Draft Additional Analysis regarding the reliability of SWP supplies, indicating that the analysis overstates supply reliability.

The Draft Additional Analysis was prepared in response to the Court of Appeal decision in the West Creek litigation. Consistent with the Court of Appeal's decision, the trial court directed that the water supply analysis in the original West Creek EIR be "revised to include the issues in the Court of Appeal decision, including, at a minimum, accurate availability, reliability and supply estimates for SWP water in wet, average and dry years, which estimates must be obtained from the Department of Water Resources."

In response to the Court's directions, West Creek's revised water supply analysis provided SWP water supply and reliability estimates for wet/average and dry years. The water analysis was based on the state DWR modeling and reporting, which were disclosed in the Draft Additional Analysis. Applying DWR's reliability projections to CLWA's current maximum annual SWP Table A Amount (95,200 acre-feet per year

(AFY)), the Draft Additional Analysis reported the varying yields in the amount of SWP water that would be available to CLWA in average, dry and multiple-dry years. DWR's modeling effort is considered the best available information for assessing the delivery reliability of SWP supplies.

For information regarding imported SWP water supplies and delivery of such supplies, the Board has considered the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 4.2.4, pp. 4.0-59 - 4.0-82.

For information regarding CLWA's SWP Table A Amount and deliveries, the Board has considered the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 4.2.4, pp. 4.0-63 - 4.0-68.

For information regarding the reliability of CLWA's SWP supplies, the Board has considered Draft Additional Analysis, pages 4.0-73 - 4.0-82.

The Board has further acknowledged appellate court decisions, among others, *Planning & Conservation League v. Department of Water Resources* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 892 (and, particularly, page 908, footnote 5, where the court noted the difference between SWP contractual water entitlements and the amount of water actually delivered by the SWP); and *Friends of the Santa Clara River v. Castaic Lake Water Agency* (2002) 95 Cal.App.4th 1373 (and, particularly, page 1376, where the court noted that DWR, which manages the SWP, has historically delivered less water than the contractual entitlements to the 29 SWP contractors).

In addition, the Board has reviewed the comments and responses portion of the Final Additional Analysis, and has acknowledged, as did the Draft Additional Analysis, that CLWA's current SWP Table A Amount of 95,200 AFY is an annual *contractual* entitlement, based on a water supply contract entered into between DWR and CLWA. All water supply contracts between DWR and its SWP contractors, including CLWA's, provide that in a year when DWR is unable to *actually deliver* the full amount of SWP contractor requests, deliveries to contractors will be *reduced*, so that total deliveries equal total available supply for that year.

The Board has further acknowledged, as did the Draft Additional Analysis, that the reliability of CLWA's current SWP Table A Amount (95,200 AFY) is affected by a number of factors, including hydrologic conditions, the status of SWP facilities' construction, environmental requirements and evolving policies for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta), where the water supplied by the SWP originates. Because of these factors, *actual* SWP supplies and deliveries are subject to *reduction*. These reductions can occur in average and dry years, and, particularly, during drought periods. For that reason, the West Creek Final Additional Analysis focused on the availability and reliability of several water sources, including SWP supplies, in average, dry and multiple-dry years. Because *reductions* in water supply can occur in average, dry and multiple-dry years (as opposed to "wet" years), the water assessment in the Final Additional Analysis focused on those years where supplies could be curtailed.

In summary, the Board has noted that neither CLWA nor the Final Additional Analysis rely on CLWA's total contractual Table A Amount of 95,200 AFY for planning purposes (*i.e.*, 100 percent of the contractual entitlement). Instead, projected supplies/deliveries of CLWA's Table A Amount are based on a varying percentage of that amount each year. CLWA's current total SWP Table A Amount (95,200 AFY) is not necessarily available each year because, as stated, several factors affect and reduce actual deliveries (*i.e.*, hydrologic conditions, SWP system storage, SWP facilities' construction, environmental constraints, water availability and evolving policies for the Delta) in average, dry and multiple-dry years.

For a specific analysis of the variability in SWP supplies available to CLWA, the Board has considered the Draft Additional Analysis, Section 2.0, pp. 2.0-1 - 2.0-13, and, particularly, Tables 2.0-1 through 2.0-6. In addition, the Board has considered the Draft Additional Analysis' summary of water supplies and demand for Santa Clarita Valley. (Section 4.2.10, pp. 4.0-92 - 4.0-98.) This discussion includes an analysis of the availability of imported water supplies, including SWP, to the Santa Clarita Valley. The planned imported SWP supplies are broken down by average/normal year and dry year.

The Board has noted that the Final Additional Analysis includes important source documents relating to SWP supplies. For example, the Board has noted that the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Vol. IV, Appendix L, includes a copy of the final *State Water Project Delivery Reliability Report*, dated 2002, issued by DWR to assist SWP contractors and others in the assessment of the adequacy of the SWP component of their overall water supplies. Information in this report is useful in assessing SWP supply reliability, which is of key importance to local agencies, like the Department and this Board, because the Department and this Board have the responsibility to plan for future growth in the context of providing an available, adequate and affordable water supply for existing and projected needs. In addition, the 2002, 2003 and 2004 *Santa Clarita Valley Water Reports* include an annual analysis of CLWA's SWP supplies and water supply reliability. The Board has considered these source documents in connection with the West Creek project and other cumulative development in the Santa Clarita Valley.

Comments have also objected to the West Creek project relying upon CLWA's purchase of an additional 41,000 AFY of SWP Table A Amount from the Kern County Water Agency (KCWA) and another water district, as part of a water transfer approved by DWR in 1999. Comments have stated that the 41,000 AFY water transfer to CLWA cannot be relied upon due to pending litigation.

Comments have stated that CLWA's EIR for the 41,000 AFY water transfer has been decertified; and, therefore, CLWA is not entitled to rely on the additional SWP water supplies until CLWA completes a new EIR. Other comments have asserted that CLWA cannot go forward with the new EIR for the 41,000 AFY water transfer, unless and until DWR first completes a separate EIR in connection with the settlement of the Monterey Agreement litigation.

As stated in the Draft Additional Analysis, this water transfer was the subject of a completed contract between CLWA, KCWA and its member district, in 1999. Under that contract, CLWA already has paid approximately \$47 million for the additional Table A Amount, the monies have been delivered and the sales price has been financed through CLWA by tax-exempt bonds. In addition, the imported water supplies associated with that transfer became available for use by CLWA starting in January 2000, and DWR has increased CLWA's current maximum SWP Table A Amount, because it was a permanent transfer and reallocation of SWP Table A water between SWP contractors. Although CLWA's EIR was decertified, both the appellate court and the trial court (on remand) have refused to preclude CLWA from continuing to receive and use the 41,000 AFY water as part of CLWA's SWP supplies, despite requests to do so by CLWA's project opponents. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the West Creek project to rely on those SWP supplies in the water service portion of the Draft Additional Analysis.

In addition, as referenced in responses to comments, CLWA completed preparation of the new EIR for the 41,000 AFY water transfer project. Since completion of the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, CLWA certified the adequacy of that EIR under CEQA. The certified EIR is currently the subject of litigation, but the EIR provides additional useful information regarding CLWA's SWP supplies and the reliability of such supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley. The certified EIR was the subject of public review and comment as part of CLWA's environmental review process.

Although the West Creek water supply and demand analysis is sufficient as a stand-alone document, the Board recognizes that both the certified 41,000 AFY EIR, and the CLWA Resolution certifying that EIR, provide additional public disclosures regarding CLWA's SWP supplies and SWP reliability data. For that reason, the Board incorporates by reference both the certified CLWA EIR and the CLWA Resolution, which are available for public inspection and review by contacting the Department, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, California 90012, Daryl Koutnik (213) 974-6461.

B. GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES AND "OVERDRAFT" CLAIMS

Comments have stated that the groundwater supplies referenced in the Final Additional Analysis exceed the "safe yields" of the Alluvial aquifer and the Saugus Formation and that water levels are decreasing, resulting in an "overdraft" condition. Associated with these comments is the stated concern that by relying on an "overdrafted" groundwater basin, the water purveyors in the Santa Clarita Valley have "overstated" available groundwater supplies.

The Department has engaged in additional consultation with CLWA, the wholesale water agency for Santa Clarita Valley, and Valencia Water Company, the retail water purveyor designated to serve the West Creek project site, and has reviewed the information contained in the Final Additional Analysis, including the technical reports supporting the water supply and demand data presented. As confirmed by the Final

Additional Analysis, there is no credible evidence showing any historic or recent trend toward permanent water level or storage decline in the basin. To confirm this information, Richard C. Slade & Associates, a registered professional hydrogeologist with substantial experience in assessing the local groundwater basins in Santa Clarita Valley, has analyzed claims of the existence of permanent water level declines, or "overdraft" conditions in the basins. The Final Additional Analysis contains Mr. Slade's report confirming that the groundwater basin is operating within an acceptable operational yield and that there are no "overdraft" conditions in the basin.

The groundwater supply projections shown in the Final Additional Analysis are based on the best available data presented by, among others, Richard C. Slade & Associates in his 2001 Update Report. This report assessed the hydrogeological characteristics, conditions and capabilities of the Santa Clarita Valley's Alluvial aquifer and Saugus Formation.

Comments have also stated that water levels in wells have reached historic lows in the eastern areas of the basin.

These comments are not substantiated by applicable documentation. As discussed below, the best available data also conflicts with these comments. In the report prepared by Richard C. Slade & Associates in response to the above comments, Mr. Slade found that the "alluvial aquifer system is not in overdraft because water levels show a rapid and significant rise following periods of rainfall. In a strict sense, if the aquifer system were in 'overdraft,' then water levels would show a continuous decline even during hydrologically "wet" periods during a long time period; the water level data do not show any such decline over the entire period of water level record." Mr. Slade also noted "even though water levels have declined in previous drought years [referring to wells in the eastern reaches of the basin], those water levels have returned in the past to historic high water levels." Consistent with his technical memorandum, Mr. Slade recently reported to the Newhall County Water District ("NCWD") that the east end of the Alluvial aquifer "continued to display a very strong correlation with a cumulative rainfall departure trends; levels declined temporarily in dry times but recover very rapidly and to a large degree in more normal or wet rainfall periods." (See, West Creek FAA, Volume IV, Appendix F.)

C. GROUNDWATER SUPPLIES AND PERCHLORATE

Several comments raise issues and concerns regarding the detection and impact of perchlorate in four municipal water supply wells located in the Saugus aquifer, and two such wells in the Alluvial aquifer. Comments state that, because these wells are not used due to the presence of perchlorate, the available pumping capacity from the Saugus and Alluvial aquifers has been reduced, but the Additional Analysis does not account for the "reduced" groundwater supplies. As a result, the comments state that the groundwater supply figures in the Final Additional Analysis are "overstated."

The Final Additional Analysis and Supplement have fully disclosed the presence of perchlorate in municipal-supply wells in both the Saugus Formation and the Alluvial

aquifer, but also noted that, according to CLWA and other Santa Clarita Valley retail purveyors, there is sufficient well capacity in uncontaminated portions of both the Saugus Formation and the Alluvial aquifer to pump the volumes of groundwater shown in the Final Additional Analysis.

The Final Additional Analysis also discussed the fact that CLWA and the retail purveyors have advised the County that even the portions of the Saugus Formation and the Alluvial aquifer where perchlorate has been detected are still capable of being used as a viable water supply over the long term, particularly in dry years, because the water is treatable. CLWA and other Santa Clarita Valley retail purveyors have further advised staff that the technology to remove perchlorate exists and is already in use in California and elsewhere. CLWA and the retail purveyors intend to use this proven technology to treat the water where perchlorate has been detected.

Finally, the Board has considered the latest information regarding the detection and removal of perchlorate in the Santa Clarita Valley groundwater basin (see, Amended 2000 UWMP). The Board finds that the Amended 2000 UWMP is consistent with the information presented in the West Creek Final Additional Analysis and that the Amended 2000 UWMP is supported by appendices and technical memoranda, including the CH2MHill *Regional Groundwater Flow Model for the Santa Clarita Valley: Model Development and Calibration* (April 2004) and the CH2MHill *Analysis of Perchlorate Containment in Groundwater Near the Whittaker-Bermite Property, Santa Clarita California* (December 2004). The Board has also considered the information presented in the West Creek Final Additional Analysis, Volume VII, Topical Response 6, relating to the Amended 2000 UWMP and related issues. Finally, the Board has considered the Supplement, which addresses perchlorate contamination in Valencia's Well Q2.

D. NCWD RESOLUTION

Comments have attached or referenced a Resolution of the Board of Directors of the NCWD regarding water supplies in the Santa Clarita Valley (Resolution No. 2004-3). The Resolution, approved on a 3-2 vote, challenges the water supply figures for the Santa Clarita Valley, which are based on the 2000 UWMP.

The Final Additional Analysis, Topical Response 5, summarizes sections of NCWD Resolution No. 2004-3, and references the actions taken by the CLWA and the City of Santa Clarita in response to that resolution. Based on the information presented in the Final Additional Analysis, including the supporting data provided in the entire record, the Department and this Board will continue to rely on CLWA's assurances that sufficient water supplies are available to serve water demand for the Santa Clarita Valley.

E. OTHER PERCHLORATE ISSUES

The Board has considered the claims raised concerning the presence of perchlorate in the Santa Clarita Valley groundwater supplies in the vicinity of the former Whittaker-Bermite facility. Based on the West Creek Final Additional Analysis,

Supplement and record, including studies, reports and evidence presented to the Board in connection with other projects in the Santa Clarita Valley, such as Newhall Ranch, the Board finds that the detection of perchlorate in the groundwater basin has been fully disclosed and does not significantly impact the reported groundwater supply capacities. In addition, CLWA and other retail water purveyors have confirmed that technology exists to treat the groundwater by removing the perchlorate and returning the groundwater to drinking water quality standards. The planning for remediation of the perchlorate is substantially underway, and the perchlorate in the basin is being appropriately monitored by CLWA, the retail water purveyors and other federal and state agencies (including ACOE and Department of Toxic Substances Control).

The detection of perchlorate was known and disclosed in public records and other documents since 1998. For example, both the CLWA Integrated Water Resources Plan ("IWRP"), dated February 1998, and the 1998 Santa Clarita Valley Water Report disclosed that perchlorate was detected in certain municipal supply wells in the Saugus aquifer.⁹ In addition, each water report issued since 1998 (1999 Water Report through 2004 Water Report)¹⁰ disclosed the presence of perchlorate in the groundwater basin, and discussed the progress being made to remediate the basin. The West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, Section 4.0, discusses the water quality in both the Alluvial aquifer and the Saugus Formation. It also addresses several perchlorate issues, including perchlorate treatment technology and other important topics relating to perchlorate.

In addition, the Department and this Board have considered evidence presented in the separate California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") proceedings involving Valencia Water Company's application for approval of its updated Water Management Program ("WMP"). The evidence and decisions by the CPUC have established that it is reasonable for Santa Clarita Valley to continue to rely on groundwater supplies from the basin in Santa Clarita Valley while perchlorate remediation proceeds. Furthermore, there is considerable expert evidence demonstrating the adequacy of the basin's groundwater supply capacities. Expert evidence also supports the feasibility of continued use and availability of those groundwater supplies during the perchlorate remediation process (see, the Supplement and the Amended 2000 UWMP, including the appendices and other technical memoranda; and, specifically, the CH2MHill *Regional Groundwater Flow Model for the Santa Clarita Valley: Model Development and Calibration* (April 2004) and the CH2MHill *Analysis of Perchlorate Containment in*

⁹ For copies of these reports, which are available for public inspection and incorporated by reference, please contact the Department, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Daryl Koutnik (213) 974-6461.

¹⁰ For copies of these water reports, all of which were previously distributed to the County, the City of Santa Clarita and other interested persons, and which are available for public inspection and incorporated by this reference, please contact the Department, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Daryl Koutnik (213) 974-6461.

Groundwater Near the Whittaker-Bermite Property, Santa Clarita California (December 2004)).¹¹

F. THE AMENDED 2000 UWMP

On September 22, 2004, the Court of Appeal for the Fifth District issued an opinion that reversed a judgment of the Kern County Superior Court upholding the adequacy of the 2000 UWMP, and remanded the case to the Superior Court with directions to vacate approval of the 2000 UWMP.¹² The Court decision focused on the discussion of ammonium perchlorate contamination detected in impacted municipal supply wells, and found that the 2000 UWMP should have: (1) addressed the time needed to implement the available method for treating the perchlorate-contaminated water in the local subbasin; and (2) described the reliability of groundwater supplies during that treatment implementation period.

In response, the local retail water purveyors directed the joint preparation and completion of the Amended 2000 UWMP, consistent with the Court's decision and the UWMP Act.¹³ The Amended 2000 UWMP provides information responsive to the issues raised in the Court's decision regarding the perchlorate-contaminated groundwater in portions of the Saugus Formation and Alluvial aquifer, the two aquifer systems that comprise the local Santa Clara River Valley East Groundwater Subbasin. This subbasin is the source of the local groundwater used for water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley.

Because the Court's decision was required to focus only on the 2000 UWMP and the information available at that time (2000), it could not consider the significant progress that the retail water purveyors and others have made in responding to the perchlorate contamination in the local groundwater subbasin. Notable factors that limited further discussion of the perchlorate contamination in 1999-2000 include: (1) the commencement of only an initial investigation of the source, nature and extent of the perchlorate contamination; (2) limited involvement in investigation and remediation by the potentially responsible party; (3) regulatory constraints on the permitting of treatment installation for restoration of impacted water supply capacity from the subbasin; and (4) lack of fiscal assurances that the water purveyors would be able to

¹¹ The Amended 2000 UWMP, the appendices and the technical memoranda, including the two CH2MHill reports referenced above, are incorporated by this reference and available for public inspection by contacting the Department, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Daryl Koutnik (213) 974-6461.

¹² For a copy of this decision, which is available for public inspection and incorporated by reference, please contact the Department, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Daryl Koutnik (213) 974-6461.

¹³ For a copy of this document, which is available for public inspection and incorporated by reference, please contact the Department, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1348, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Daryl Koutnik (213) 974-6461.

restore impacted source capacity at the expense of the potentially responsible party, and not the public, or more specifically, local ratepayers and taxpayers.

Since the 2000 UWMP was adopted, the local retail water purveyors have since initiated actions to address all those factors, and planning for remediation of perchlorate has progressed significantly. During that time, a substantial body of information has been developed and is included in the Amendment. This information includes the Supplement and the Amended 2000 UWMP, the appendices and technical memoranda, including the CH2MHill *Regional Groundwater Flow Model for the Santa Clarita Valley: Model Development and Calibration* (April 2004) and the CH2MHill *Analysis of Perchlorate Containment in Groundwater Near the Whittaker-Bermite Property, Santa Clarita California* (December 2004).

G. WESTERN SPADEFOOT TOAD

The western spadefoot toad was discovered on the West Creek site after the County already circulated for review and public comment the West Creek Draft Additional Analysis, which addressed the water supply and demand issues associated with the West Creek project in response to the court decision in the West Creek litigation. The California Department of Fish and Game and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designate the western spadefoot toad as a special status species. As a result, the Department directed preparation of the AEA Spadefoot to address the environmental effects associated with the confirmed discovery of the western spadefoot toad on the West Creek project site. The original West Creek EIR, at pages 4.3-62 through 4.3-63, contained mitigation measures relating to special-status wildlife species (see, Mitigation Measures 4.3-5 - 4.3-8). In addition to those mitigation measures, the AEA Spadefoot identified two additional measures to mitigate impacts to the western spadefoot toad (see, Mitigation Measures 4.3-9 - 4.3-10).

The Board has thoroughly reviewed the AEA Spadefoot, along with the public comments and responses to those comments. Potential impacts to western spadefoot toad were not considered significant after mitigation under the unique circumstances presented by this project. These unique circumstances rendering impacts to western spadefoot insignificant after mitigation consist primarily of the fact that: (a) the western spadefoot was found in artificial man-made retention basins, not natural habitat or disturbed natural habitat; (b) the spadefoot in all likelihood relocated to those retention basins as "opportunists" from nearby existing undisturbed habitats; (c) the spadefoot likely relocated from off-site areas to the retention basins, because the spadefoot, if it occupied development Area C, likely could not have survived the grading and recompaction operations that occurred in that area; and (d) the retention basins were constructed to "catch" run-off from adjacent areas and, as constructed, they contain too much water to allow the spadefoot to persist in those basins due to the high potential for predators to develop in those basins; as such, these basins are not considered suitable habitat for the spadefoot.

H. DISCOVERY OF PERCHLORATE IN VALENCIA'S WELL Q2

After this Board certified the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis, the project applicant advised the Department and this Board that Valencia Water Company had confirmed the detection of perchlorate in Valencia's Well Q2.

In response, Valencia removed the well from active service, and requested Luhdorff & Scalmanini Consulting Engineers to prepare a report assessing the impact of, and response to, the perchlorate contamination in Valencia's Well Q2 (Q2 Report). Since perchlorate was first discovered in the Santa Clarita Valley (i.e., 1997), Valencia municipal-supply wells have been monitored on a quarterly to semi-annual basis. In addition, monitoring wells installed on and adjacent to the Whittaker-Bermite site have been monitored on an ongoing basis by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC).

The Q2 Report documents that the perchlorate detected in Well Q2 does not significantly impact the water supplies used to meet demand in the Santa Clarita Valley. Valencia's response plan for Well Q2 is to pursue permitting and installation of wellhead treatment by the fall of 2005, which will return the well to water supply service in advance of the demand for water generated by the West Creek project, which is expected to occur no earlier than 2007. DHS and Valencia have already commenced meetings to discuss the permitting process required for wellhead treatment at Well Q2. In addition, Valencia Water Company has submitted its permit application to DHS for the well treatment, and has obtained funding for the permitting and wellhead treatment process.

The Supplement was circulated for public review and comment. The Board has considered both the public comments and the responses to comments on the Supplement. The Board finds that the responses provide additional useful information supporting the determination that the detection of perchlorate in Well Q2 does not significantly impact Valencia's ability to provide water service to the West Creek project in addition to other planned and future uses in the Santa Clarita Valley.

I. ISSUES RAISED IN PUBLIC COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

In reviewing public comments, and responses to those comments, the Board finds that the Department has made a good-faith effort to respond to the environmental issues raised in connection with the West Creek project. The written responses to comments are considered an important part of the West Creek Final Additional Analysis and original West Creek EIR. The Board further finds that the Department has supported its written responses to public comments by presenting important appendix material and other documents, which are part of the West Creek Final Additional Analysis.

IV. FINDINGS REQUIRED BY CEQA

Pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, no public agency may approve or carry out a project where an

EIR has been certified that identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out, unless the public agency makes one or more findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) Changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR.

For those significant effects that cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.

In accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board adopts these findings as part of its certification of the original West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement.

V. ORGANIZATION/FORMAT OF FINDINGS

These CEQA Findings are organized in the following manner:

Section 1 of these findings discusses the potential environmental effects of the project, which are not significant or which have been mitigated to a level of insignificance;

Section 2 discusses the significant unavoidable environmental effects of the project, which cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance;

Section 3 contains findings regarding the growth inducing impacts of the project;

Section 4 contains findings regarding alternatives;

Section 5 contains findings regarding the revised Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project;

Section 6 contains the project's Statement of Overriding Considerations;

Section 7 discusses the Section 15091 and 15092 findings; and

Section 8 discusses the Section 21082.1(c)(3) findings.

The Board finds that the findings set forth in each section are supported by substantial evidence in the original West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement and the West Creek record of proceedings.

SECTION 1

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR WHICH HAVE BEEN MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

All West Creek EIR mitigation measures (as set forth in the revised Mitigation Monitoring Program attached as Exhibit A to these findings) have been incorporated by reference into the conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permit No. 98-008-(5). In addition, the other conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permit No. 98-008-(5) and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 52455 further mitigate the potential effects of the project.

The Board has determined that these mitigation measures and conditions of approval will result in substantial mitigation of the project and cumulative effects on geotechnical resources, flood, traffic/access, noise, water service, education, library services, wastewater disposal, fire/ sheriff services, population/housing/employment, cultural resources, environmental and man-made hazards, utilities and parks/recreation/trails. The Board has determined that these effects are not significant or have been mitigated to a level of insignificance.

(1) Geotechnical Resources

Potential Effect: Project site grading would require the movement of approximately 8 million cubic yards of earth (cut/fill). The grading would be balanced on-site and would entail mass grading for development areas, fine grading for development pads, remedial grading depending upon future site-specific roads and geologic investigations and custom grading. With regards to the Decoro Drive Bridge, earthwork necessary to construct the facility would involve recompaction of approximately 18,300 cubic yards of cut and 60,900 cubic yards of fill, requiring importation. There are a number of known landslides on the project site and the San Gabriel Fault Zone and associated Alquist-Priolo Zone are located along the southern site boundary. Portions of the project site may be subjected to surface seepage during the rainy seasons, and localized areas of high ground water can present nuisance-type problems. Construction activities are not expected to extend into the water table.

Finding: Implementation of measures required under current State and County guidelines will ensure the safety of future residents and that no impacts will occur to surrounding properties. Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will ensure the potential impacts identified in the West Creek EIR remain at an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. The project would be graded in accordance with the Hillside Design Guidelines published by the Department.
2. The location and dimensions of the exploratory trenches and borings shall be noted relative to future building plans, unless the trenches and/or borings are removed by future grading operations. If future foundations do traverse the trenches or borings, they shall be evaluated by the project soils engineer for mitigation measures relative to potential settlement.
3. Nine estate lots have been proposed on Lots 366 to 374. No grading has been proposed in the area of these lots. Any future development of these lots will require a geologic/geotechnical investigation and report.
4. An alternate (school pad) grading concept may occur in the vicinity of Lots 866-911, which would consist of lowering proposed grades (that range from 1385 to 1335) for Lots 866 through 11 from 1368 feet to 1330 feet for the school pad. If and when it is decided to convert Lots 866 through 911 into an elementary school, specific recommendation, relative to slope stability will be addressed at that time.
5. Areas that are to receive compacted fill shall be observed by a qualified geotechnical engineering firm ("Geotechnical Engineer") prior to the placement of fill.
6. All drainage devices shall be properly installed and observed by Geotechnical Engineer and/owner's representative(s) prior to placement of backfill.
7. Fill shall be placed in controlled layers (lifts), the thickness of which is compatible with the type of compaction equipment used. The thickness of the compacted fill layer shall be adjusted to obtain proper compaction with the equipment used, and generally shall not exceed an allowable thickness of 8 inches. Each layer shall be compacted to a minimum compaction of 90 percent relative to the maximum dry density determined per the latest ASTM D1557 test. Density testing shall be performed by Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm to verify relative compaction. The contractor shall provide proper access and level areas for testing.
8. Where space limitations do not allow for conventional fill compaction operations, special backfill materials and procedures may be required. Pea gravel or other select fill can be used in areas of limited space. A sand and portland cement slurry (2 sacks per cubic-yard mix) shall be used in limited space areas for shallow backfill near final pad grade, and pea gravel shall be placed in deeper backfill near drainage systems.

9. Fill soils shall consist of imported soils or on site soils free of organics, cobbles, and deleterious material and shall be approved by Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm. Rocks larger than 6 inches in diameter shall not be used unless they are sufficiently broken down. All imported soil shall be granular, non-expansive, with an Expansion Index (EI) less than 30. Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm shall evaluate and/or test the import material for its conformance with the specifications prior to its delivery to the site. The contractor shall notify the geotechnical engineering firm 72 hours prior to importing material to the site.
10. Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm shall observe the placement of compacted fill and conduct in-place field density tests on the compacted fill to check for adequate moisture content and the required relative compaction. Where less than specified relative compaction is indicated, additional compactive effort shall be applied and the soil moisture conditioned as necessary until adequate relative compaction is attained.
11. The Contractor shall comply with the minimum relative compaction out to the finish slope face of fill slopes, buttresses, and stabilization fills as set forth in the specifications for compacted fill. This may be achieved by either overbuilding the slope and cutting back as necessary, or by direct compaction of the slope face with suitable equipment, or by any other procedure which produces the required result.
12. Any abandoned underground structures, such as cesspools, cisterns, mining shafts, tunnels, septic tanks, wells, pipelines or others not discovered prior to grading, are to be removed or treated to the satisfaction of the Soils Engineer and/or the controlling agency for the project.
13. The Contractor shall have suitable and sufficient equipment during a particular operation to handle the volume of fill being placed. When necessary, fill placement equipment shall be shut down temporarily in order to permit proper compaction of fills, correction of deficient areas, or to facilitate required field testing.
14. The Contractor shall be responsible for the satisfactory completion of all earthwork in accordance with the project plans and specifications.
15. Final reports shall be submitted after completion of earthwork and after the Soils Engineer and Engineering Geologist have finished their observations of the work. No additional excavation or filling shall be performed without prior notification to the Soils Engineer and/or Engineering Geologist.
16. Whenever the words "supervision," "inspection" or "control" are used, they shall mean observation of the work and/or testing of the compacted fill by Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm to assess whether substantial compliance with plans, specifications and design

concepts has been achieved, and does not include direction of the actual work of the contractor or the contractor's workmen.

17. Trench excavations to receive backfill shall be free of trash, debris or other unsatisfactory materials prior to backfill placement, and shall be observed by Geotechnical Engineer's representative or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm.
18. Trench backfills shall be compacted to at least a relative compaction of 90 percent. Trench backfills underlying pavements shall be compacted to a minimum relative compaction of 95 percent, to a depth of at least 24 inches below the pavement section. Relative compaction is defined as the ratio of the in-place soil dry density to the laboratory maximum dry density, as determined by the ASTM D1557 test method.
19. Except as stipulated herein, soil obtained from the excavation may be used as backfill if they are essentially free of organics and deleterious materials.
20. Rocks generated from the trench excavation not exceeding 3 inches in largest dimension may be used as backfill material. However, such material may not be placed within 12 inches of the top of the pipeline. No more than 30 percent of the backfill volume shall contain particles larger than 1 1/2 inches in diameter, and rocks shall be well mixed with finer soil.
21. Per County of Los Angeles Guidelines, soils (other than aggregates) with a Sand Equivalent (SE) greater than or equal to 20, as determined by ASTM D 2419 Standard Test Method or at the discretion of the engineer or representative in the field, may be used for bedding and shading material in the pipe zone areas. These soils are considered satisfactory for compaction by jetting procedures.
22. Trench backfill other than bedding and shading shall be compacted by mechanical methods as tamping sheepsfoot, vibrating or pneumatic rollers or other mechanical tampers to achieve the density specified herein. The backfill materials shall be brought to within 3 percent of optimum moisture content, then placed in horizontal layers with a thickness compatible to the material being placed and the type of equipment being used. Each layer shall be evenly spread, moistened or dried as necessary and then tamped or rolled until the specified density has been achieved.
23. The contractor shall select the equipment and process to be used to achieve the specified density without damage to the pipeline, the adjacent ground, existing improvements or completed work.
24. Observations and field tests shall be carried on during construction by Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm to confirm that the required degree of compaction has been obtained. Where compaction is less than that specified, additional compaction effort shall be made with adjustment of the moisture content as necessary until the specified

compaction is obtained. Field density tests may be omitted at the discretion of the engineer or his representative in the field.

25. Whenever, in the opinion of a qualified geotechnical engineer or the Owner's Representative(s), an unstable condition is being created by either cutting or filling, the work shall not proceed until an investigation has been made and the excavation plan revised, if deemed necessary.
26. Fill material shall not be placed, spread, or rolled during unfavorable weather conditions. When the work is interrupted by heavy rain, fill operations shall not be resumed until field tests by Geotechnical Engineer or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm indicate the moisture content and density of the fill are as specified.
27. The walls of temporary (construction) trenches for subdrains shall stand vertical provided the trench depth does not exceed 5 feet and heavy equipment is not allowed within five feet of the edge of the trench. Where trench alignments are in sloping terrain, vertical trench walls shall not be excavated to depths greater than 4 feet. Shoring of trench walls or flattening of slopes to a 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical) slope or flatter will be required if deeper trenches are necessary or if the presence of gravel pockets, loose sands, weak material or adverse dipping beds indicate a potential for localized raveling or instability.
28. All work associated with trench shoring shall conform to the State of California, Division of Industrial Safety Code (Cal OSHA).
29. The maximum removals of alluvium required are down to 18 feet at CPT-6, CPT-7 and HS-1 and down to 16 feet at CPT-8, CPT-9, HS-2 and HS-3. Recommended removal depths in these areas range from 18 to 20 feet and 16 to 20 feet respectively on the Removal Depths Map (Sheet 1 of 4 of Figure 4.1-1).
30. Recommended alluvial removals in the larger canyons on the site can range from 5 to 20 feet in the same general area.
31. Alluvial removals shall be performed during the summer months when the deeper recommended removal depths should coincide approximately with some of the ground water depths Geotechnical Engineer encountered in exploratory borings drilled in the late winter to early spring 1998.
32. In proposed graded areas in the smaller canyons and on the slope flanks, all artificial fill, surficial soils, slopewash, loose alluvium and weathered bedrock (TQs and Qt) shall be completely removed to flanks firm bedrock. Recommended removal depths in these narrower canyons typically range from 2 to 10 feet. Isolated "pockets" of deeper removals (greater than 10 feet) will be necessary where warranted. The recommended removal depths are shown on Sheet 1 of 4 of Figure 4.1-1.

33. A minimum 3-foot thick cap fill shall be placed on level cut lots within the Saugus Formation to serve as a relatively impermeable blanket course for impeding seepage of surface runoff into exposed, adversely dipping beds of that formation. The cap fill shall be compacted to the same requirements as the engineered fill. Borrow sources would be from nearby areas of required excavation.
34. Areas and conditions requiring capping shall be identified by the geotechnical engineer or the engineering geologist during construction, and the capping recommendation revised as warranted.
35. Excavated material to be used for the construction of site fills shall not contain organic matter, shall have no rock or similar irreducible material with a maximum dimension greater than six (6) inches, and shall be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer before use. It will be permissible to selectively place large rock fragments over six (6) inches in size within the fill. (A description of such selective placement is shown on Figure 3 of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Report ("Seward Report") included in the Technical Appendices to the EIR.) Imported material, if required, shall be nonexpansive and predominantly granular and shall be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer before use. Alluvial material may be used in earth fill operations provided that the material is relatively free of organic matter.
36. Any oversize boulders, if encountered, may be incorporated into the fill as rock fill in windrows after being reduced to the specified maximum rock fill size (see Figure 3 of the Seward Report).
37. Depressions or ruts created in the process of grading operations shall be properly backfilled with suitable fill compacted to not less than 90 percent relative compaction. Where native soil remains, the upper 6 inches of the native soil subgrade exposed during stripping or excavation shall be scarified, moisture-conditioned, and properly compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction prior to fill placement. All fill material shall be placed in uniform lifts not exceeding 8 inches in its loose state and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction as determined based on the latest ASTM Test Designation D-1557.
38. In areas to receive compacted fill, where the surface gradient is steeper than 5:1 (horizontal:vertical), the soil mantle shall be removed and such areas benched horizontally into competent material prior to or in conjunction with fill placement. This would also apply to all backfill placed on landslide excavations slopes. Keys would be required at the toes of embankments and observations shall be provided by the Engineering Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer to determine where these keys are needed. All keys shall be constructed to a minimum of 15 feet in width and 2 feet in depth below subgrade after topsoil removal. Key requirements are depicted in Figure 4, "Fill Slope Over Natural Slope" of the Seward Report.

39. Required grading in the following manner: (a) Material obtained from excavations in harder bedrock will probably be more granular and shall be placed in the lower portions of fills to minimize settlements and to improve subsurface drainage. These materials, however, shall not substitute for drain blankets and/or subdrains otherwise required; (b) Where practical, material that is principally clayey shall be placed on the outer portions of fill slopes to minimize erosion and to provide a suitable base to support plant growth. These clayey blankets shall not impede the drainage path of seepage water through the fill; (c) No adversely inclined layering of clay soils shall be allowed in embankment fills or within sidehill fills over natural ground where ground slope is steeper than 5:1 (horizontal:vertical); (d) Use of material consisting of oversized rock fragments in fills throughout the site shall be avoided within the expected depth-of-trenching for utilities in street areas and generally in the upper 10 feet, as a minimum; (e) Materials suspected of being potentially highly expansive shall be placed in the lower portions of area fills to minimize potential adverse effects on structures placed on the fills; (f) All grading operations within MWD's right-of-way are to be reviewed and approved by MWD personnel.
40. No specific building foundation designs are required at this time. The following general foundation criteria are provided for future design and planning consideration. The proposed grading plan shall generally involve the following foundation support conditions: (a) Foundation support within bedrock in cut areas; (b) Foundation support within engineered fill; (c) Foundation support within transition zones of cut and fill.
41. Shallow spread footings for foundation support of up to two-story residential, commercial or light industrial developments can adequately be derived from native soils, processed as necessary, and bedrock or engineered fill compacted as recommended herein. Heavier structural support, if applicable, shall be addressed at the Grading Plan stage. Bearing capacity data and lateral resistance of footing walls shall be provided at the Grading Plan stage.
42. Retaining wall geotechnical design parameters shall be provided at the Grading Plan stage.
43. Pavement design recommendations will be provided at the Grading Plan stages.
44. Figure 7, "Cut Lot (Transitional)" and "Cut-Fill Lot (Transitional)" of the Seward Report shall serve as a foundation grading detail for locations where foundations will straddle transition zones of cut and fill. Figure 8 of that report provides overexcavation recommendations at lots where the building is placed over the crest of a natural slope and part of the building would be on compacted fill and part on bedrock. In addition, extra foundation slab reinforcement shall be provided in these cases.
45. Temporary construction cuts, such as stabilization keyway excavations may be constructed at slopes steeper than 1 1/2:1. Actual geologic and ground water

conditions identified in the grading plan stage of the project and also the expected duration of the open face will govern the recommended slope for stability of the cut slope.

46. An Engineering Geologist shall observe all cut slopes during grading and provide recommendations for necessary modifications.
47. The standard setbacks from ascending and descending slopes provided in Section 1806.4 of the 1996 Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code shall be followed, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations.
48. For proposed Cut-Slope CS-13, the top of the ridge shall be cut to an elevation of 1382 feet or lower, as shown on Cross Section 28-28'.
49. Cut-slopes and fill slopes at the site will be sloped at a 2:1 (horizontal to vertical) inclination or flatter. Sandy materials will be susceptible to erosion; therefore, cut and fill slopes shall be sodded or planted, if practicable, as soon as the grading work is completed in order to minimize erosion.
50. Benches or terraces at least 8 feet in width shall be established at vertical intervals of not more than 25 feet on all cut or fill slopes to control surface drainage and collect debris. Where only one bench is required, it shall be at mid-height. For cut or fill slopes greater than 100 feet the terrace near mid height shall not be less than 20 feet in width.
51. Swales or ditches on all terraces shall have a minimum gradient of 5 percent and shall be paved with gunite, or approved equal. They shall have a minimum depth at the deepest point of 12 inches and a minimum paved width of eight (8) feet.
52. Mitigation for cut slopes shall comply with the requirements identified in the Cut-Slope Summary - Table 2 of the Seward Report.
53. Cut-slopes less than 25 feet in height with adverse geologic or grading configurations (fill over cut) shall be, if necessary, with a standard 15 foot wide stability fill.
54. All permanent cut-slopes in both alluvium and bedrock shall be constructed at a slope ratio not steeper than 2:1 (horizontal to vertical).
55. An Engineering Geologist shall observe all cut slopes during grading and provide recommendations for necessary modifications.
56. All cut slopes along Copper Hill Drive shall be constructed pursuant to the Grading Plan for the extension of Copper Hill Drive by Geotechnical Engineers (see Ref. Nos. 25, 26, 39, 40 and 41 of the Seward Report).
57. To minimize significant settlements, upper soils in areas to receive fills shall be removed and recompact to competent materials. No specific foundation design loads are required at this time. The design grades to be achieved by highest fills,

may be placed sufficiently ahead of building construction to induce potential settlements ahead of time.

58. Fill slopes shall be constructed at a slope ratio not steeper than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). To minimize the probability of slumping and/or erosion of fill slopes, the faces of such slopes shall be properly treated. Proper compaction of the face shall be accomplished by constructing the fill at least 6 feet (horizontally) beyond the planned final face plane, and compacting to not less than 90 percent relative compaction throughout. The slope face shall then be trimmed back to the final face plane. This operation shall expose properly compacted material on the finished face of the slope.
59. In areas where a fill slope will be constructed immediately above a cut slope, the cut slope shall be constructed prior to placement of fill. A setback of at least 6 feet shall be provided between the top of the cut and the toe of the fill. Details of typical fill over cut slope conditions are shown on Figure 6, "Typical Fill Above Cut Slope" of the Seward Report.
60. In areas where fill slopes will be constructed above natural ground, all topsoil and slopewash shall be removed and the fill keyed into firm earth a minimum of 2 feet, measured at the toe of the fill slope, and then benched, as shown on Figure 4, "Fill Slope over Natural Slope" of the Seward Report.
61. All landslide removals shall be completed under continuous observations by the project geologist.
62. Landslide VII is to be mitigated pursuant to measures identified in the Seward In-Progress Grading Plan Report for Revised Tract 49400.
63. Landslide VIII is to be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the project engineering geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
64. Landslide IX shall be either removed, or a debris basin large enough to contain its volume shall be designed. Final recommendations relative to this landslide will be determined by the Geotechnical Engineer once the use of Lot 483 is known.
65. Landslide XI shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
66. Landslide XIII shall be completely removed under continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.

67. Landslide XV shall be removed under continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that it is entirely removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
68. Landslide XVI shall be removed under continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
69. Landslide XVII shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
70. Landslide XVIII shall be removed under continuous observations of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
71. Landslide XIX shall be completely removed during grading operations for TT 52455 under the supervision of the Geotechnical Engineer.
72. Landslide XX shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
73. Landslide XXI shall be completely removed under continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
74. Landslide XXII shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
75. Landslide XXIII shall be completely removed during grading operations for TT 52455 under the continuous observations of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference id/or later additional grading.
76. Landslide XXIV shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.

77. Landslide XXVII shall be completely removed during grading operations for Copper Hill Drive under continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
78. Landslide XXX shall be completely removed during grading operations for Copper Hill Drive under continuous observations of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
79. Landslide XXXI shall be completely removed during grading operations for Copper Hill Drive under continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
80. Landslide XXXIII shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
81. Landslide XXXIV shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Geotechnical Engineer. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.
82. Any surficial failure material which remains below proposed grade shall be removed prior to the placement of certified fill.
83. Removal depths shown on the Seward's Removals Map (Sheet 1 of 4) shall be adhered to.
84. The large boulders (oversize material) in the terrace deposits shall be exported from the site or special handling (via Windrows) will be needed to mitigate the oversized material.
85. A detailed analysis of debris flow hazard shall be undertaken at the Grading Plan stage for the site. Should mitigation prove necessary, the following measures are available to reduce the potential debris flow hazard: (a) remove loose surficial material, (b) construct diverter slough walls, (c) construct impact walls, (d) construct debris basins, (e) control run-off, and/or (f) plant selective deep-rooted vegetation.
86. Artificial fill deposits shall be completely removed and replaced and recompacted, as necessary, prior to the placement of engineered fill.

87. Dump fill deposits shall be completely removed and replaced and recompact, as necessary, prior to the placement of engineered fill.
88. Sewage sludge shall be incorporated only in fills beneath roadways.
89. The existing provisions in the Grading Ordinance for planting and irrigation of constructed slopes in conjunction with drainage recommendations provided in the section "Surface Drainage Control," shall be implemented to prevent potential erosion within the subject site.
90. Temporary construction cuts, such as stabilization keyway excavations, may be constructed at slopes steeper than 11/2:1. Actual geologic and ground water conditions identified for the grading plan stage of the project and also the expected duration of the open face shall govern the recommended slope stability of the cut slope.
91. Whenever seepage is observed the condition must be evaluated by the Geotechnical Engineer prior to covering with fill material so that the necessary subdrain system is established. As a minimum, a subdrain shall be placed in all major swales or alluvial valleys below proposed major fills (see Figure 9 in the Seward Report).
92. Fill slopes shall be provided with subsurface drainage as necessary for stability. Geologically recommended canyon subdrain locations will be provided at the Grading Plan stage, when detailed 40-scale maps are available. The final location, spacing, and design of subdrains shall be determined by the Geotechnical Engineer from field observations during grading operations. A subdrain shall be placed beneath all major fills in any alluvial valley or swale where a fill is planned.
93. Backdrains shall be provided for Stability Fills and Buttresses.
94. A synthetic geomembrane (such as high-density polyethylene-HDPE) with a coefficient of permeability of 10⁻⁶ cm/sec, or less shall be placed beneath the proposed tank sites. The barrier shall extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond the edge of the tank. A leakage collection and removal system (LCRS) shall be provided between the tank bottom and the geomembrane. Specific design recommendations for the membrane and the drainage system shall be provided at the Grading Plan stage.
95. All finished pad surfaces faces shall be sloped to drain, with all depressions or ruts created during grading operations properly backfilled to eliminate ponding.
96. Drainage control design shall include provisions for positive surface gradients to ensure that surface runoff is not permitted to pond, particularly above slopes or adjacent to building foundations or slabs.
97. Surface runoff shall be directed away from slopes and foundations and collected in lined ditches or drainage swales, via non-erodible drainage devices, which

shall discharge to paved roadways, or existing watercourses. If these facilities discharge onto natural ground, means shall be provided to control erosion and to create sheet flow.

98. Cut and fill slope terraces shall be provided with suitable drainage gradients and permanently lined ditches capable of collecting and transporting runoff water to suitable discharge points.
99. Inlets of any pipes shall be designed against clogging and for minimum maintenance.
100. Lateral discharge pipes shall be designed to accommodate some movement (slip joints) and underground conduits shall have cleanout facilities.
101. Terraces shall be provided with suitable access in order to permit periodic cleaning and maintenance.
102. Unless replaced by non-to-low-expansive soils to at least 4 feet below footing/slab bottoms, building foundations placed on expansive rock materials shall be constructed as follows: (a) Footing Depth: (1) Perimeter 24"; (2) Interior 18"; (b) Footing Reinforcement: one #4 top & bottom; (c) Floor Slab Thickness: 5 inches and provide footing/slab interface low friction joints at perimeter walls; (d) Floor Slab Reinforcement: #4 at 18" each way; (e) Provide Moisture Barrier: 2" sand and visqueen + 2" sand; and (f) Premoist (avoiding ponding) the subgrade 24 hours before pouring concrete.
103. The standard setbacks from ascending and descending slopes provided in Section 1806.4 of the 1996 Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code shall be followed, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations.
104. The top of the ridge shall be cut to an elevation of 1382 feet or lower as shown in Figure 4.1-1.
105. In order to minimize the potential for ground lurching and shattered ridge effects on the proposed elevated water tank pads, it is recommended that the proposed water tanks be setback a minimum of 15 feet from the top of the adjacent descending slopes.
106. To mitigate seismically-induced settlements, existing earth materials shall be removed to 16 feet to 18 feet at the general location of CPT-6 and CPT-7, and then tapered to 4 foot removals to CPT-1 location. At the general location of CPT-8 and CPT-9A, existing earth materials shall be removed to 16 feet.
107. To mitigate seismically-induced settlements, a cap of 29 feet shall be placed at HS-1 location.
108. To mitigate seismically-induced settlements and based on currently proposed grades, the existing grade shall be raised about 17 feet at HS-1 location which, in

conjunction with a 16 foot removal, will provide a cap of 33 feet at this location which is greater than the conservative required cap of 29 feet

109. To mitigate seismically-induced settlements, extra reinforcement in addition to structural requirements shall be provided for footings and slabs of buildings in the general locations of HS-1, CPT-7, CPT-6, CPT-8 and CPT-9A, and to the east of these locations.
110. The project shall implement one or more of the following corrosion control measures, as appropriate, to increase the life of metal construction materials that would be subject to significant corrosion: (a) Abrasive blast underground steel utilities and apply a high quality dielectric coating, such as extruded polyethylene, a tape coating system, hot applied coal tar enamel, or fusion bonded epoxy; (b) Bond underground steel pipe with rubber gasketed, mechanical, grooved end, or other non-conductive type joints for electrical continuity. Electrical continuity is necessary for corrosion monitoring and cathodic protection; (c) Electrically insulate each buried steel pipeline from dissimilar metals, cement-mortar coated and concrete encased steel, and above-ground steel pipe to prevent dissimilar metal corrosion cells and to facilitate the application of cathodic protection; (d) Apply cathodic protection to steel piping as per NACE International RP-0169-92; (e) As an alternative to dielectric coating and cathodic protection, apply a cement mortar coating or encase in cement-slurry or concrete 3 inches thick, using any type of cement; (f) Coat hydraulic elevator cylinders as described above. Electrically insulate each cylinder from building metals by installing dielectric material between the piston platen and car, insulating the bolts, and installing an insulated joint in the oil line. Apply cathodic protection to hydraulic cylinders as per NACE International RP-0169-92. As an alternative to electrical insulation and cathodic protection, place each cylinder in a plastic casing with a plastic watertight seal at the bottom; (g) The elevator oil line should be placed above ground if possible but, if underground, should be protected as described above for steel utilities; (h) Encase cast and ductile iron piping in 8 mil thick low-density polyethylene or 4 mil thick high-density, cross-laminated polyethylene plastic tubes or wraps per AWWA Standard C105 or coat using polyurethane, extruded polyethylene, or hot applied coal tar enamel. However, do not use the low density polyethylene wrap on flange joints or any other sharp-edged items. As an alternative, encase iron piping with cement slurry or concrete at least 3 inches thick surrounding the pipe, using any type of cement. Electrically insulate underground iron pipe from dissimilar metals and above ground iron pipe with insulated joints; (i) No special precautions are necessary for bare copper tubing for cold water. Hot water tubing installed underground would be subject to a higher corrosion rate. The best corrosion control measure would be to place the hot copper tubing above ground. If buried, encase in plastic pipe to prevent soil contact, or apply cathodic protection; (j) On any type of pipe, coat bare steel appurtenances, such as bolts, joint harnesses, or flexible couplings, with a coal

tar or elastomer based mastic, coal tar epoxy, moldable sealant, wax tape, or equivalent after assembly; (k) Where metallic pipelines penetrate concrete structures such as building floors or walls, use plastic sleeves, rubber seals, or other dielectric material to prevent pipe contact with the concrete and reinforcing steel; (l) any type of cement or standard concrete cover over reinforcing steel may be used for concrete structures and pipe in contact with these soils; (m) Pre-stressed concrete piles will contain at least eight sacks of type 2 pre-stress cement per cubic yard of concrete, a water/cement ratio not exceeding 0.45, and 1.5 inches of concrete cover. No further corrosion control measures are required for such piles. If ground water is present, solid steel lifting lugs are recommended to prevent ground water from wicking into the pile interior. If wire rope lifting lugs are used, they should be carefully drilled out 1.25 inches deep and the hole filled with epoxy or grout; (n) Steel piles are most susceptible to corrosion in disturbed soil where oxygen is available, further dissimilar environment corrosion cell would exist between the steel embedded in concrete, such as pile caps and the steel in the soil, in the cell, the steel in the soil is the anode (corroding electrode), and the steel in concrete is the cathode [protected electrode], so this cell should be minimized by coating the part of the steel piles that will be embedded in concrete to prevent contact with concrete and reinforcing steel; (o) Steel piles should be abrasive blasted and coated with coal tar epoxy 15 mils thick from the top to 10 feet below any disturbed soil or the water table is less than 30 feet below grade. Although this tough coating may be abraded or damaged somewhat during driving, it will provide a great deal of protection. After driving, cutoff, and welding any steel to be attached to the piles, coat all bare steel to be encased in concrete; (p) As an alternative, bare steel piles may be used with a corrosion allowance that will depend on disturbed soil and water table depth; (q) Steel pipe pile interiors may be protected by filling with concrete or hermetically sealing both ends.

(2) Flood

Potential Effect: Earthwork during development of the site would have the potential to increase erosion during periods of heavy rain. In the post developed condition, the presence of debris proposed as part of this project would reduce the deposition of debris in the drainages. No on-site, upstream, or downstream flooding would occur as a result of the proposed project. Temporary erosion control measures would control construction phase runoff and operational runoff would be controlled by non-erosive materials such as, slope, storm and subsurface drains.

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project design will reduce the identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. All on- and off-site flood and water quality control improvements to be designed and constructed in accordance with the policies and standards of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Flood Control Division.
2. The project applicant shall, as necessary, financially participate in the construction of that portion of PD2771 needed to adequately accommodate project generated runoff.
3. The applicant shall acquire appropriate permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) prior to the commencement of any work within the San Francisquito Creek.
4. The applicant shall adhere to the following conditions relative to development within and adjacent to the southerly-flowing blueline stream: If threatened or endangered species could be impacted by the work proposed, the project applicant shall obtain the required state and federal threatened and endangered species permits or have CDFG-approved measures in place to ensure no impacts occur, prior to proceeding with the project. If work has commenced and threatened or endangered species could be impacted, all work shall cease until the applicant obtains the required permits or has CDFG-approved measures in place to ensure no impacts occur; (a) If mature perennial trees (including oak, elderberry, sycamore, and willow) will be removed from the stream's bed and/or banks, they shall be replaced in-kind at a 1:1 ratio at a CDFG-approved site, if installed two years in advance of the removal of habitat from the construction site. If replacement cannot be installed two years in advance, the replacement ratio shall be 3:1. The replacement habitat shall be maintained until established, under the direction of a CDFG representative; (b) An inventory of native trees, including but not limited to, willows, cottonwoods, walnuts, oaks, elderberry, and sycamores, by species and Diameters at Breast Height (DBH), with DBHs in excess of four inches, which must be removed shall be submitted to the Department prior to construction. No vehicles shall be driven in, and no work shall be conducted in, ponded or flowing areas except as required for construction (e.g., Decoro Drive Bridge, bank stabilization, water quality filters, trails and implementation of mitigation measures (e.g., ox-bow pond relocation); (c) Staging/storage areas for equipment and materials shall be located outside of the stream; (d) No equipment maintenance shall be done within or near any stream channel or lake margin where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas under any flow; (e) No debris, soil, silt, sand, bark, slash, sawdust, rubbish, cement or concrete or washings thereof, oil or petroleum products or other organic or earthen material from any construction, or associated activity of whatever nature shall be allowed to enter into or placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into, waters of the United States. When operations are completed, any excess materials or debris shall be removed from the work area. No rubbish leaks shall be deposited within 150 feet of the high water mark of any stream or lake.

The applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Fish and Game Code 1600 et seq., or meet other requirements as deemed necessary by the CDFG.

5. If the construction of the proposed desilting inlets, and/or water quality filters along the site boundaries requires grading on adjacent properties, agreements from the affected adjacent property owner(s) shall be obtained prior to the recording of the final map.
6. Prior to the approval and recordation of final maps, a Final Drainage Plan and Final Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) must be prepared by the applicant to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after development of the project site and proposed off-site drainage facilities. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. Temporary erosion control measures may include minimizing existing vegetation removal; using temporary soil covers, such as hydroseeding, to protect exposed soil from wind and rain; and installing silt fencing, berms (i.e., sandbagging), and dikes to protect storm drain inlets and drainage courses. Permanent erosion control measures may include drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps.
7. The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). These requirements currently include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The SWPPP shall, at minimum, address material storage and handling procedures; equipment operation, storage, maintenance, and repair procedures; construction site cleanliness; and erosion control measures. The LACDPW shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.

(3) Traffic/Access

Potential Effect: The project is estimated to produce approximately 34,400 average daily trips (ADT), of which 22,739 would be accounted for by residential land uses and the remainder by non-residential land uses. Project-generated traffic will impact intersections and road segments in the local area. Without mitigation to reduce those impacts, the intersections and road segments identified in the "Facts" below might potentially operate at an unacceptable level of service ("LOS").

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project design will reduce the potential impacts identified in the West Creek EIR to an

insignificant level. The Traffic Study in the West Creek EIR (Appendix E) and the professional evaluation of the Traffic Division of the County Department of Public Works support the conclusion that these mitigation measures will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. The project applicant would construct all on-site local roadways and intersections to LACDPW standards.
2. The project would contribute its fair share towards the construction of the following five roadway links:
 1. Copper Hill Drive between McBean Parkway and Rye Canyon
 2. Newhall Ranch Road between Rye Canyon Road/Copper Hill Drive and Avenue Tibbits/Dickason Drive, and Avenue Scott between Avenue Tibbits and McBean Parkway.
3. Based on the Ambient Growth Scenario impact analysis, the following improvements, shown in Table 4.5-8 of the EIR, shall be in place prior to occupancy of the project, except that one or more of these mitigation measures may be modified or eliminated if: (1) the improvement has been constructed by others; or (2) an Ambient Growth Scenario traffic report approved by the LACDPW prior to recordation provides a modified list of improvements to be constructed for the project, or for an individual phase of the project:

Roadways

- Copper Hill Drive between McBean Parkway and Rye Canyon Road: Construct new four-lane roadway
- Newhall Ranch Road between Rye Canyon Road/Copper Hill Drive and Avenue Tibbits/Dickason Drive: Construct new four-lane roadway
- Avenue Scott between Avenue Tibbits and McBean Parkway: Construct new four-lane roadway

Intersections - County jurisdiction

- McBean Parkway/Decoro Drive: Add second northbound through lane
- McBean Parkway/Copper Hill Drive: new west leg - provide one northbound through lane, two northbound right turn lanes, two eastbound through lanes, two westbound left turn lanes, and two westbound through lanes
- The Old Road/I-5 southbound ramps: Convert northbound right turn lane to free right

Intersections - City Jurisdiction

- I-5 northbound ramp/Magic Mountain Parkway: Add one northbound right turn lane
- Bouquet Canyon Road/Newhall Ranch Road: Convert second eastbound through lane to second eastbound right turn lane
- Avenue Scott/Rye Canyon Road: signalize intersection
- Seco Boulevard/Bouquet Canyon Road: Convert second southbound right turn lane to shared southbound left and right turn lane
- Bouquet Canyon Road/Soledad Canyon Road intersection: Add third eastbound left turn lane and add overlap phasing for westbound right turn lane
- McBean Parkway/Magic Mountain Parkway: Add fourth northbound through lane and add overlap phasing for westbound right turn lane
- Avenue Tibbits/Avenue Scott: Convert eastbound right turn lane to second eastbound through lane
- Stanford/Rye Canyon Road: Convert second northbound through lane to second northbound left turn
- McBean Parkway/Avenue Scott: New intersection - provide two northbound left turn lanes, three northbound through lanes, three southbound through lanes, one eastbound left turn lane, and two eastbound right turn lanes with overlap phasing

Intersections - County/City Joint Jurisdiction

- Copper Hill Drive/Newhall Ranch Road: New intersection - provide two northbound through lanes, one northbound right turn lane, two southbound left turn lanes, two southbound through lanes, two westbound left turn lanes, two westbound right turn lanes
 - McBean Parkway/Newhall Ranch Road: Add fourth eastbound through lane (not required using City methodology)
4. Based on the Interim Year Scenario, the project shall fund its fair share of the improvements or construct improvements to the highway network of equal value.
 5. If a Bridge and Thoroughfare District is formed which includes the project area, the project developer shall pay the applicable Bridge and Thoroughfare fee, or shall provide highway and/or intersection/interchange improvements of an equal value in lieu of the Bridge and Thoroughfare fee.
 6. To facilitate transit service to the site, the project applicant shall coordinate with the local transit agency provide to identify appropriate on-site bus stop/turnout locations.
 7. For gated entrances, methodology to calculate queuing storage shall be calculated in conformance with the Queuing Analysis of the EIR.

(4) Noise

Potential Effect: Activity associated with construction of the project could generate both steady state and episodic noise that could expose on and off site residents, employees and visitors on the site to short-term noise impacts. The increased vehicle trips associated with occupancy of the project would increase ambient noise levels along local roadways. Increased human presence on the site would also result in increased noise levels.

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project design will reduce the identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. All construction activity occurring on the project site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Standards," County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Los Angeles County Code §12.08.440.
2. All construction activities near occupied on- and off-site residences shall be limited to between the hours of 6:30 A.M. and 8:00 P.M., and exclude all Sundays and legal holidays pursuant to County Department of Public Works, Construction Division standards.
3. Prior to the issuance of building permits, an acoustical study shall be conducted for residential uses planned along the following roadway segments: (a) 550 foot segment of Copper Hill Drive located due south of the MWD Fee Property; (b) 800 foot segment of "OO" Street located due south of the MWD Fee Property. The acoustical study shall review the site specific uses proposed on these lots and provide design guidance so that interior noise levels resulting from outside sources will not exceed adopted County standards for the specified use. Design/mitigation features may include orientation and placement of buildings and windows, elevation changes, berms, the use of double-paned windows, sound walls, and noise insulation. Noise measurements shall be conducted prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy to ensure that the noise levels with proposed mitigation features are within adopted County standards.
4. All residential air conditioning equipment installed within the project site shall adhere to the requirements of the "County of Los Angeles Residential Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Noise Standards," County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.530. Specifically, equipment installed shall not exceed the any of the following noise levels: 55 dB(A) at any point on neighboring property line, 5 feet above grade level, no closer than 3 feet from any wall; 50 dB(A) at center of neighboring patio, 5 feet above grade level, no closer than 3 feet from any wall; 50 dB(A) outside the neighboring living area

window nearest the equipment location, not more than 3 feet from the window opening, but at least 3 feet from any other surface.

5. All stationary and point sources of noise occurring on the project site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Los Angeles County Code §12.08.390.
6. For the commercial centers and elementary school, loading, unloading, opening, closing, or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans or similar objects between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. shall occur in a way that prevents a noise disturbance from impacting residences (County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, Los Angeles County Code §12.08.460).

(5) Water Service

Potential Effect: Based on the Final Additional Analysis, Supplement and the entire record, the West Creek project would be served by the Valencia Water Company with no adverse impact to existing or future water supplies. The estimated water demand of the proposed project is 2,194 AFY in an average year. Project water demand increases in a dry year by approximately ten percent to a total of 2,413 AFY.

To meet this demand, water would be provided to the project by the Valencia Water Company. The project site is located within the Valencia Water Company service area. Water sources expected to be used by Valencia Water Company include a combination of SWP water delivered through CLWA and local groundwater supplies from the Alluvial aquifer and the Saugus Formation.

A summary of the water supply and demand available for the West Creek project in conjunction with the existing water demand in the Santa Clarita Valley, as well as future cumulative water demand in the Valley under near-term and long-term conditions, is presented above in Section II, Background, Subsection H, Water Supply and Demand Summary. The above summary is based on the Final Additional Analysis and the West Creek record of proceedings.

Based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, sufficient water supplies from the SWP can be reliably delivered through CLWA to serve the West Creek project. In addition, the Final Additional Analysis applied DWR's reliability projections to CLWA's SWP Table A Amount, and noted that such an amount is affected by, and can be reduced due to, a number of factors, including hydrologic conditions, the status of SWP facilities' construction, environmental requirements, and evolving policies for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. In addition, the Final Additional Analysis pointed out that SWP supplies vary from year-to-year depending on many identified factors. As a result, CLWA and the retail water purveyors in the Valley have emphasized developing SWP supplies in conjunction with local groundwater and other water supplies in order to meet the Valley's water demand under varying hydrologic conditions (e.g., average year, dry year and multiple-dry years).

The Final Additional Analysis concludes that, in 2002, there was adequate and reliable water supplies available in the Santa Clarita Valley to serve the existing population and to also supply water needed for the West Creek project, if implemented at that time.

In addition, based on the record, the Final Additional Analysis concludes that adequate and reliable water supplies exist in the Santa Clarita Valley to serve the West Creek project and the existing and future population during future average, dry and critical-dry years. In conjunction with that analysis, the Final Additional Analysis uses estimates of SWP supplies provided by the state DWR, as directed by the courts in the West Creek litigation. The Final Additional Analysis also calculates and analyzes the difference between SWP entitlements and actual available SWP water supplies, and made it clear that SWP entitlements are *not* equivalent to actual deliveries of SWP water.

Furthermore, based on the record, the Final Additional Analysis concludes that CLWA and the local retail water purveyors in the Santa Clarita Valley have the capability to deliver adequate and reliable supplies of water to their customers and that their delivery capability is not significantly impacted by the 1997 discovery of perchlorate in four Saugus Formation supply wells, the 2002 discovery of perchlorate in an Alluvial aquifer well (Stadium well) or the 2005 discovery of perchlorate in a second Alluvial aquifer well (Well Q2).

Finally, the proposed project's on-site improvements to the water delivery system will be made and no significant impacts to the water delivery system of Valencia Water Company would be created. In addition, CLWA, the wholesale water purveyor to Valencia Water Company, maintains sufficient water treatment capacity to treat the potable water supply that would be needed for the proposed project.

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project design will reduce the identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Prior to recordation of the final tract map, the applicant shall provide to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works a letter from Valencia Water Company ("VWC") which states that VWC will provide water service to the final map area; that the system will be operated by the purveyor; and that, under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division.
2. A potable water system with appurtenant facilities to serve all potable water users shall be designed and constructed to the design standards and provisions of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows as determined by the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden.

3. Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall pay the applicable connection fee charged to new development by the Castaic Lake Water Agency ("CLWA").
4. Water conservation measures, as required by the State of California, shall be incorporated into building plans for the project. These may include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) Health and Safety Code Section 17921.3 which requires low-flush toilets and urinals in all new construction; (b) Title 24, California Administrative Code Sections 2-5352(i) and (j) which require insulation of water-heating systems and pipe insulation to reduce water used before hot water reaches equipment or fixtures; and (c) Government Code Section 7800 which specifies that lavatories in all public facilities be equipped with self-closing faucets.
5. Landscape and irrigation plans for each lot/parcel in VTTM No 52455, with landscape areas greater than 2,500 square feet shall conform to the Los Angeles County Efficient Landscape Ordinance.
6. Major graded slopes adjacent to natural areas shall be landscaped with vegetation that will eventually naturalize and require minimal or no irrigation.

(6) Education

Potential Effect: The project site area is served by the Saugus Unified School District (elementary schools), the Castaic Union School District (elementary and middle schools) and the William S. Hart High School District (middle and high schools). Based on the current capacity at those schools and the number of additional students that the project may generate, the project could significantly impact these schools by causing enrollment to exceed capacity.

Finding: Conditions of project approval will reduce the above referenced impact to a level of insignificance.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measure will be made conditions of project approval in order to mitigate the identified impacts.

1. The applicant shall comply with the terms of the Saugus Funding Agreement dated February 1997. The Agreement between the project applicant and the Saugus District will provide for full mitigation of the project's impact on schools in both the Saugus and Castaic Districts. The Agreement provides for school facilities meeting State standards to be constructed in time to serve the students generated by the project.
2. The applicant shall comply with the terms of the Hart Funding Agreements dated December 17, 1997 and October 15, 1998. The Agreement between the project applicant and the Hart District will provide for full mitigation of the project's impact on schools in the Hart District. The Agreement provides for school facilities meeting State standards to be constructed in time to serve the students generated by the project.

(7) Library Services

Potential Effect: The increased demand for library services from the project is considered a potentially significant impact unless mitigated.

Finding: The project will generate surplus general fund tax revenue of \$4.8 million during the first five years and \$1.7 million per year thereafter. This, and additional conditions of approval for the project will reduce the impacts identified in the West Creek EIR to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will mitigate the identified impact:

1. The applicant shall pay the permanent library fee (\$569.87 per new residential unit) to the County Library to offset the demand for library items and building square footage generated by the proposed project. The library mitigation payment shall be made on a building permit by building permit basis. This per unit mitigation fee of \$569.87 would generate a maximum total of \$1,450,319.10 in library fees if all units proposed were built, and would fund new library space and materials which would be needed to serve the project.

(8) Wastewater Disposal

Potential Effect: The proposed project would generate approximately 0.66 million gallons of wastewater per day which would be treated at the Valencia Water Reclamation Plant (County Sanitation District No. 32). The site is fully located within District No. 32. Project wastewater treatment demands can be met by the unused capacity of the Santa Clarita Valley Joint Sewerage System Water Reclamation Plants 26 and 32. No wastewater infrastructure currently exists on the project site and surrounding land uses are served by one existing 8-inch line along Dickason Drive. Other lines are planned which are intended to serve existing and planned uses in the vicinity of the project and a 21" relief main will be constructed along Dickason Drive to accommodate projected project flow.

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project design will reduce the identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval in order to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Prior to recordation of the final tract map, a letter shall be obtained from the CSDLAC and provided to LACDPW verifying that there is sufficient capacity in the receiving trunklines and the Valencia WRP to serve the final map.
2. The applicant shall pay the applicable CSDLAC connection fees prior to issuance of connection permit(s).
3. The proposed 10-inch and 21-inch trunklines are to be designed, constructed, and dedicated to the CSDLAC in accordance with their standards and procedures.

4. All local sewer lines within the project boundaries are to be designed, constructed, and dedicated to the LACDPW in accordance with its standards and procedures.

(9) Fire/Sheriff Services

Potential Effect: Implementation of the project would result in an increase in calls for fire and sheriff services.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will mitigate the impacts identified in the West Creek EIR to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval in order to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. As final building plans are submitted to the County for approval in the future, County Sheriffs Department design requirements, which would reduce demands for service and ensure adequate public safety, shall be incorporated into building designs, including the following measures: (a) Lighting shall be provided in open areas and parking lots; (b) The required building address numbers shall be readily apparent from the street for emergency response agencies.
2. Concurrent with the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay the Los Angeles County Fire Department Developer Fee.
3. Prior to recordation of a final subdivision map in which urban uses will permanently adjoin a natural area, a Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan as required by Section 1117.2.1 of the County Fire Code shall be prepared and approved by the County Fire Department.
4. Each final subdivision map for the proposed project shall provide sufficient capacity for fire flows of 1,250 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual pressure for a two hour duration for single family residential units, and 5,000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure for a five-hour duration for multi-family residential units and commercial/retail uses with a floor plan in excess of 35,000 square feet, or such other fire flow required by the County Fire Department.
5. Prior to framing, site access shall be provided to comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code which requires all weather access.
6. Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants.
7. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, development shall comply with County Building and Safety and Fire Code requirements associated with the provision of adequate site vehicular access (County Fire Code 10.207), and fire prevention and suppression.

8. Prior to recordation of final subdivision map(s) the project shall satisfy all conditions of approval for Tentative Subdivision Map 52455 relating to the provision of vehicular and Fire Department access.
9. The applicant shall install Fire Department - approved street signs and building numbers prior to issuance of occupancy permits.

(10) Population/Housing/Employment

Potential Effect: At project build-out, the project would increase the number of residential dwelling units to 2,545, providing housing for 7,627 persons. Commercial retail space would be increased by 180,000 square feet, and generate approximately 497 jobs.

Finding: No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of project implementation.

Facts: The above finding is made for the following reasons:

1. The project is consistent with the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan and the County General Plan.
2. The project represents 3.0 percent of the County projected housing for the year 2010 in the Santa Clarita Valley.
3. The project represents 3.0 percent of the County projected population for the year 2010 in the Santa Clarita Valley.
4. The proposed housing units will provide market rate housing opportunities for residents who may work in the project or in the vicinity of the project. Employment opportunities located in the vicinity of the project site include the Valencia Industrial Center, the Valencia Commerce Center, and the Valencia Corporate Center, as well as other retail, commercial, and industrial work located in the Santa Clarita valley. The project will provide housing opportunities for the job force located within these centers. Consequently, the proposed project will not result in significant impacts related to employment opportunities.

(11) Cultural Resources (Archaeological/Historical/Paleontological)

Potential Effect: The Saugus formation, which underlies the project site, has a record of producing important invertebrate and vertebrate remains at several localities within the Santa Clarita Valley, but there is no specific information to suggest the presence of culturally important resources on this site, and a Phase I study indicated a low probability of such resources being present.

Finding: No potentially significant impacts will occur, and conditions of approval of the project would reduce any potential impacts identified during development to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval:

A Los Angeles County Natural History Museum -- approved inspector is to be on site during an appropriate number of excavations into the Saugus Formation. Should the excavations yield significant paleontological resources, excavation shall be stopped or redirected until the extent of the find is established and the resources are salvaged.

(12) Environmental and Man-Made Hazards

Potential Effect: There are 16 abandoned oil wells on the project site that were used for crude oil production which could have an impact on residential and non-residential development in areas previously occupied by the oil production facilities. There are also a series of high voltage, electrical transmission lines traversing the site.

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project will reduce identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Only non-habitable structures shall be located within Southern California Edison easements.
2. A disclosure statement shall be provided on the title to each residential lot informing prospective purchasers of the existence of electromagnetic fields.
3. Wells on the property shall be abandoned in compliance with the requirements of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas. If any undocumented oil wells are encountered during grading operations, the casing shall be immediately surveyed for locations and inspected by the Division of Oil and Gas, for leaks.
4. In accordance with provisions of the Los Angeles County Building Code, all buildings and enclosed structures that would be constructed within the site and located within 25 feet of oil or gas wells shall be provided with methane gas protection systems. Buildings located between 25 and 200 feet of oil or gas wells shall, prior to issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, be evaluated in accordance with the current rules and regulations of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas.

(13) Utilities

Potential Effect: The project will generate additional demand for utility services such as electricity, gas or propane.

Finding: Conditions of approval for the: project will reduce the identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Prior to the recordation of the final tract map, the applicant shall provide to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works a letter from both the Southern

California Edison Company and the Southern California Gas Company indicating their ability to provide energy to the project.

2. Structures in the proposed development shall be required to meet the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24). Meeting these specifications would conserve non-renewable natural resources to levels acceptable to the State of California.
3. The applicant shall comply with guidelines provided by the SCE in regard to easement restrictions, construction guidelines, and potential amendments to right-of-way in the areas of any existing Edison Company easements.

(14) Parks, Recreation and Trails

Potential Effect: The project in terms of its anticipated addition to the population, would generate a need for 22.89 acres of land or in-lieu fees equivalent to that acreage.

Finding: Conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project design will reduce the identified potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the following measures will be made conditions of project approval so as to mitigate the identified impacts:

1. The project shall dedicate 8.97 acres of park land.
2. The applicant shall pay the in lieu parkland fee established by the County Parkland Dedication Ordinance in effect at the time of Map recordation. Payment of this fee will cover the projected 4.96 acre shortfall in parkland associated with the proposed project. Presently this fee stands at \$129,000 per acre for Park Planning Area 35C, which equates to an in lieu fee of \$639,840.
3. The applicant shall develop private community recreation areas as described in section 4.14.4.a (1) and Figure 14.23-2 of the West Creek EIR. The applicant shall implement an approximately 12,000 linear foot segment of the proposed Los Angeles County San Francisquito Canyon Trail, as depicted on the Los Angeles County Biking and Hiking Trail Map. The applicant shall develop and dedicate to the County of Los Angeles Department of Parks and Recreation a 15.43 acre public park located on the MWD fee property.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

(1) Potential Cumulative Geotechnical Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on geotechnical resources.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential geotechnical effects identified in the West Creek EIR. With anticipated mitigation the cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the measures set forth in Section 1 above will mitigate the project-related onsite geotechnical resources impacts to a level that is considered less than significant. In addition, impacts to geotechnical resources from related projects are not cumulatively significant since site specific and site-specific mitigation measures similar to those imposed on the project and consistent with Los Angeles County requirements and the Uniform Building Code will be required of all such projects.

(2) Potential Cumulative Flood Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction, with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on flood/water quality.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential flood/water quality effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: Of the related projects identified in the West Creek EIR, several are proposed within the Santa Clara River watersheds as well as specifically within the watershed of San Francisquito Creek, a tributary of the Santa Clara River. Although related projects within the watersheds could affect the quality and velocity of flows within Santa Clara River, the project; is subject to requirements of the Los Angeles County department of Public Works and Regional Water Quality Control Board - Los Angeles Region, and has been designed so that post-development flows will be less than pre-development flows. Since the project would not represent a significant change in the quantity or quality of flow in the river, its contribution to cumulative impacts would be negligible. Other projects can be expected to be similarly conditioned such that no significant cumulative impacts would occur.

(3) Potential Cumulative Traffic/Access Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on traffic/access.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential traffic/access effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: The County and City of Santa Clarita apply similar mitigation measures to cumulative projects as applied to this project, and the County will require fair-share participation of other development projects in the required mitigation. Therefore, no unavoidable significant cumulative impacts associated with traffic and access are anticipated.

(4) Potential Cumulative Noise Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on noise.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to noise impacts identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: Implementation of standard noise abatement measures on the project and other developments in the vicinity will mitigate potentially significant cumulative noise levels.

(5) Potential Cumulative Water Service Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. Based on the Final Additional Analysis and the record, because available cumulative water supplies exceed demand, even assuming a "worst case" projection of future growth, cumulative development (including the proposed project) would not result in significant unavoidable cumulative impacts on Santa Clarita Valley water resources.

In order to analyze the cumulative water impacts of the West Creek project in combination with other expected future growth, the amount and location of growth expected to occur in addition to the proposed project was predicted through the use of two separate cumulative development scenarios. The two cumulative development scenarios analyzed in the Final Additional Analysis are referred to as the "SB 610 Water Supply Assessment Scenario" and the "Santa Clarita Valley 2025 Build-Out Scenario."

Under the first cumulative scenario analyzed, based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, it was concluded that there will be sufficient water supply available to meet the project's demand in addition to existing and other planned future uses. Under the second "worst case" cumulative scenario analyzed, based on the Final Additional Analysis and record, it was concluded that available cumulative water supplies exceed demand, even assuming a "worst case" projection of future growth (cumulative development, plus the proposed project). Because available cumulative water supplies exceed demand, the Final Additional Analysis found no significant unavoidable cumulative impacts on Santa Clarita Valley water resources.

In response to comments, the Department also updated its General Plan Development Monitoring System ("DMS") water analysis. Under the updated DMS Buildout Scenario set forth in the Final Additional Analysis, Volume III (April 2004), Response 6 to letter from Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment (SCOPE), dated January 27, 2004, the Final Additional Analysis shows that a surplus of water would occur. Consequently, no significant cumulative water impacts would occur under the Department's DMS water analysis.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential water service effects identified in the Final Additional Analysis to the original West Creek EIR.

The cumulative impacts of the West Creek project in conjunction with other related projects are not significant.

Facts: All future development projects in the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area are required by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to demonstrate that an adequate supply of water exists. Based on the West Creek Final Additional Analysis and the entire record, no significant cumulative impacts would occur to Santa Clarita's water resources.

(6) Potential Cumulative Wastewater Disposal Impacts: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on wastewater treatment services and facilities.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential sewage treatment services and facilities effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: The above finding is made in that the features incorporated into the project design and the measures set forth in Section 1 above will mitigate the project-related wastewater impacts to a level that is less than significant. Future developments will be required to demonstrate adequate trunkline and treatment plant capacity which can be expanded through the payment of fees.

(7) Potential Cumulative Education Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on education.

Finding: Conditions of approval will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential education effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: As developments provide their required share of school funding through payment of fees pursuant to conditions similar to those imposed on the project or through agreements with affected school districts, cumulative impacts will be less than significant.

(8) Potential Cumulative Library Services Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on library services.

Finding: Conditions of approval will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential library servicing effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: Implementation of mitigation measures similar to those imposed on the project will reduce cumulative impacts on library services to a less than significant level.

(9) Potential Cumulative Fire/Sheriff Services Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on fire/sheriff services.

Finding: Developer fees, revenues and conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential fire/sheriff services effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: Participation in developer fee programs and increases in taxes paid would reduce these potential cumulative impacts to less than significant levels.

(10) Potential Cumulative Population/Housing/Employment Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on population/housing/employment.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential population/housing/ employment effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Fact: Implementation of mitigation measures similar to those imposed on the project will reduce cumulative impacts in population/housing/employment to a less than significant level.

(11) Potential Cumulative Environmental and Man Made Hazards Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on environmental and man made hazards.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential effects on environmental and man-made hazards identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant

Facts: Implementation of mitigation measures similar to those imposed on the project will reduce cumulative impacts on environmental and man-made hazards to a less than significant level.

(12) Potential Cumulative Parks, Recreation and Trails Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on parks, recreation and trails.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential effects on parks, recreation and trails identified in the West Creek EIR. With anticipated mitigation, the cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: Implementation of mitigation measures similar to those imposed on the project will reduce cumulative impacts on parks, recreation and trails to a less than significant level.

(13) Potential Cumulative Utilities Impact: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site: The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on utilities.

Finding: Conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential effects on utilities identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: Implementation of mitigation measures similar to those imposed on the project will reduce cumulative impacts on utilities to a less than significant level.

(14) Potential Cumulative Impact on Population/Housing/Employment: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site: The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, could have a significant cumulative impact on population/housing/employment.

Finding: Features incorporated into the project design will avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to the potential population/housing/employment effects identified in the West Creek EIR. The cumulative impacts of related projects are not significant.

Facts: The population, housing and employment increases due to cumulative impacts are consistent with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional growth projections. In addition, the placement of residential uses in proximity to planned existing employment centers is consistent with the intent of the jobs/housing balance to reduce vehicle mile traveled.

SECTION 2

SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

The County has determined that, although the West Creek EIR mitigation measures, design features included as part of the project and conditions of approval imposed on the project will provide substantial mitigation to the following effects, such effects cannot be feasibly mitigated to below a level of significance. Consequently, in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (see, Section 6) to substantiate the decision to

accept these significant unavoidable impacts due to the significant benefits afforded by the project.

(1) Air Quality

Potential Construction-Related Effects: Implementation of the proposed project would generate construction-related pollutant emissions. Construction-related emissions would take the form of fugitive dust generated by grading activity and air pollutants generated by on-site stationary sources, heavy equipment, construction vehicle use and energy use.

Finding: The impacts identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, mitigation measures will reduce, to the extent feasible, the adverse environmental effect.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), and in that the following measures will partially mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Construction parking should be configured to minimize traffic interference.
2. Temporary traffic controls will be provided to maintain traffic flow when construction activities have the potential to disrupt traffic (e.g., signage, flag person, detours).
3. Construction activities that affect traffic flow will be scheduled to off-peak hours to the degree practicable.
4. A construction traffic management plan will be developed for use when construction traffic has the potential to affect traffic on public streets. The plan should include provisions for the following: (a) Rerouting construction traffic off congested streets to the degree practicable; (b) Consolidating truck deliveries when possible; and (c) Providing temporary dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off of the site.
5. Equipment and vehicle engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers' specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust emissions.
6. Use of all construction equipment operations will be suspended during second stage smog alerts.
7. Electricity from power poles will be used when present, practicable, and cost effective rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators.
8. Methanol or natural gas-powered mobile equipment and pile drivers will be used instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.
9. Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.

10. The project shall comply with and implement the applicable provisions of the most recently adopted SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 403 Implementation Handbook.
11. The project shall comply with and implement the applicable provisions of the most recently adopted SCAQMD Rule 1113.

Potential Operation-Related Effect: Implementation of the proposed project would generate operation-related pollutant emissions by the use of motor vehicles, the use of energy on-site and off-site and the operation of on-site commercial activities. Despite implementation of feasible mitigation measures, operation-related emissions would still exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds; therefore, potentially significant long-term air quality impacts could occur as a result of this project.

Finding: This impact cannot feasibly be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will reduce, to the extent feasible, the significant unavoidable environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), and in that the following measures will partially mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Low emission water heaters in residential uses will be used if readily available, practicable, and cost effective, to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.
2. Residential uses are to utilize built-in energy-efficient appliances to reduce energy consumption and emissions.
3. Shade trees shall be provided in residential subdivisions to reduce building heating/cooling needs.
4. Residential uses are to utilize energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners to reduce energy consumption and emissions.
5. Special sunlight-filtering window coatings or double-paned windows shall be installed in residential uses to reduce thermal gain or loss.
6. Automatic lighting on/off controls and energy-efficient lighting in new residential construction (including parking areas) shall be utilized to reduce electricity consumption and associated emissions.
7. If possible, light-colored roofing materials in new residential construction shall be used as opposed to dark roofing materials. These materials would reflect, rather than absorb, sunlight and minimize heat gains in buildings. This measure would lessen the overall demand for mechanical air conditioning systems.
8. Low emission water heaters in commercial uses shall be utilized if readily available, practicable, and cost effective to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.

9. Shade trees shall be provided adjacent to commercial buildings to reduce building heating/cooling needs.
10. Commercial uses are to utilize energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners to reduce energy consumption and emissions.
11. Automatic lighting on/off controls and energy-efficient lighting shall be utilized in new commercial and office construction (including parking areas) to reduce electricity consumption and associated emissions.
12. If possible, light-colored roofing materials shall be utilized in new commercial and office construction as opposed to dark roofing materials.
13. Bus stops shall be sited at locations to be determined in coordination with the bus transit service provider that will serve the project area
14. On-site circulation plans for commercial parking lots shall be designated and implemented to reduce vehicle queuing.
15. If fast-food restaurants are approved for development on the site, traffic flow shall be improved at restaurant drive-through windows by designing separate windows for different functions and by providing temporary parking for orders not immediately ready for pickup.
16. If allowed by the County's parking code, employee parking shall be reduced for those commercial businesses not subject to SCAQMD Rule 2202.
17. Bus stops at commercial locations will be sited as determined in coordination with the bus transit service provider that will serve the project area.
18. On-site truck loading zones shall be provided within commercial developments.
19. Commercial employers shall provide commuter information areas that contain displays providing information on bus routes and schedules, MetroLink schedules and routes, and the names and numbers for various commercial shuttle services.
20. The commercial centers, which would be greater than 25,000 gross square feet in size, shall comply with the County's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance (Ordinance No. 93-0028M) in effect at the time the map application is deemed complete.

(2) Biota

Potential Effects: Implementation of the project would involve the loss of riparian vegetation created by the placement of abutments supporting Decoro Drive Bridge, loss of upland habitat within the proposed setback buffer as a result of the trail system and Decoro Drive Bridge, partial obstruction of a wildlife corridor as a result of the bridge, potential impacts on unarmored threespine stickleback movement as a result of higher water velocities in the creek, net loss of wildlife habitat, and the increased presence of humans and domestic animals.

Finding: The impacts identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval will reduce, to the extent feasible, the significant unavoidable environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), and in that the following measures will partially mitigate the identified impacts:

1. The applicant shall prepare and implement a vegetation planting and maintenance plan acceptable to the County and appropriate resource agencies developed by a qualified habitat restoration specialist to address the above revegetation measures. The plan will specify, at a minimum, the following: (1) the location of the planting site; (2) the quantity and species of plants to be planted; (3) planting procedures, including the use of irrigation; (4) the amount and location of exotic species removed from riparian habitat areas, if appropriate; (5) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the plantings for a minimum 5 year period; and (6) a list of criteria (e.g., growth, plant cover, survivorship) by which to measure success of the plantings, as well as contingency measures if the plantings are not successful. Guidelines for preserving remaining riparian habitat shall also be included in the planting and maintenance plan. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the County Department of Regional Planning biologist, ACOE, and CDFG prior to issuance of project grading permits.
2. The permanent loss of cottonwood-willow riparian woodland, alluvial scrub, and riparian scrub vegetation as a result of development activities shall be mitigated through replacement of this habitat with habitat of similar functions and values to that being removed. The habitat shall be replaced by the applicant at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio installed two years in advance of the removal of habitat at the construction site. If replacement habitat cannot be installed two years in advance of the project, the replacement ratio shall be 3:1 for these communities. Replacement of this habitat shall be located in the creekbed, or at suitable locations outside the creekbed where there are appropriate hydrologic conditions to create a self-sustaining riparian habitat. Replacement shall not occur in areas already designated for mitigation of impacts as a result of other project activities along the river. First priority for revegetation location shall be given to other riparian areas located within the project site boundaries. After the completion of Decoro Drive Bridge, current "Arizona" crossings shall be removed and revegetated. If no suitable locations can be found, then revegetation shall occur in suitable locations immediately adjacent to the site, or in the immediate vicinity, within the San Francisquito Creek or Santa Clara River drainage and as approved by Los Angeles County and appropriate resource agencies and jurisdictions (CDFG, USFWS, and/or Army Corps). Native plant species similar to those being removed will serve as a basis for the vegetation replacement.

Revegetation will occur in areas already containing similar vegetation and in such a way as to create large, contiguous blocks of habitat.

3. If enough locations cannot be found to fully mitigate lost riparian habitat at the ratios described above, then the removal of exotics (i.e., non-native, invasive plant or animal species) such as *Arundo donax* may be conducted by the applicant in lieu of the remaining revegetation that could not be completed, as determined by the County Department of Regional Planning, CDFG, and ACOE. Because the infestation of these species can dramatically decrease the biological values and functions of riparian habitats comprised of native plant species, the intent of this alternative is to enhance/increase the functions and values of already established riparian habitat that have been infested by exotic plant species. There are five major stands of *Arundo* within the project area, clustered within the riparian scrub habitats in the central portion of the reach, and within the margin of the alluvial scrub below Decoro Drive, wherein removal efforts may be concentrated. Clearing the species from these areas and revegetating them with cuttings from site stock would provide a rapid increase in natural scrub habitat values. The amount of exotic plants to be removed shall be determined by a qualified restoration biologist and approved by the County Department of Regional Planning biologist and appropriate resource agencies and jurisdictions (CDFG and/or Army Corps) with the overall goal being to increase riparian values and functions of established areas to the same level as that being removed as a result of project implementation. The removal program shall utilize methods and procedures approved by Fish and Game and Army Corps to remove exotics, including but not limited to, mechanical equipment in specific areas, hand cutting, and the application of herbicides to stumps. Removal areas shall be kept free of exotic plant species for five years after initial treatment. Plant removal methodologies, locations, and monitoring shall be included as part of the revegetation plan.
4. No earlier than 45 days and no later than 20 days prior to the removal of any wildlife habitat during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (February 1 through August 1), the applicant shall have a field survey be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of special-status birds (including raptors) are present in the construction zone or within 300 feet of the construction zone. If construction is proposed during the breeding and nesting season, such surveys will be conducted at bi-weekly intervals during the months of April, May, and June. In the event that an active nest is spotted in the habitats to be disturbed, or in other habitats within 300 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction within 300 feet shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged (which typically takes 3-4 weeks for most small birds), as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The field survey shall be

conducted to the satisfaction of the County and monthly reports submitted by the biological monitor to the County during grading operations.

5. To avoid disturbance such as siltation and sedimentation into special-status fish and arroyo toad breeding areas and the potential loss of special-status fish species, including arroyo chub and Santa Ana sucker, the construction and maintenance of the bridge, water quality filters, entrapment and filtration features, as well as direct inflow-structures shall not occur during water flows determined by a qualified biologist with experience with these fish and the toad to be adequate for these species to occur within the project site or immediately downstream from the project site (typically immediately after periods of heavy or consistent rain). These activities shall not alter or damage habitat values for these species, nor place materials or structures in the habitat which have the potential to adversely affect these species.
6. Alternatively, if construction activities must occur during time periods when special-status fish species, other than UTS, are likely to be in the river systems, prior to initiating these activities, all construction sites and access roads within the creekbed, as well as all creekbed areas within 300 feet of the construction site and access roads, shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of the species listed above. If present, all construction sites and any temporary access roads within the creekbed shall be cleared of the species listed above immediately before the prescribed work is to be carried out, immediately before any equipment is moved into or through the stream or habitat areas, and immediately before diverting any stream water. State and federal agencies will be notified prior to any construction activities.
7. The removal of such species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist using procedures approved by the USFWS and CDFG, and with the appropriate endangered species permits. A plan to temporarily relocate these species shall be developed before the action in coordination with the USFWS and CDFG. The County shall be notified of any temporary relocation effort prior to construction and submit a follow-up report after the operation is completed.
8. The loss of 7.41 acres of riparian habitat that is expected to serve as migration foraging and resting habitat for least Bell's vireo will be mitigated through the replacement of this habitat as specified in Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-4. If habitat removal is conducted during the vireo breeding season, surveys shall be conducted prior to removal to ensure no nesting vireos are present.
9. For all grading and construction activities within 300 feet of riparian resources, a County-approved biologist shall be retained at the expense of the applicant as a construction environmental monitor to ensure that incidental construction impacts on biological resources are avoided or minimized, and to conduct pre-grading field surveys for special-status plant and wildlife species that may be destroyed as a result of construction and/or site preparation activities. The biological

monitor will be given authorization to stop specific construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. Responsibilities of the construction environmental monitor include the following: (a) Attend all pre-grade meetings to ensure that timing/location of construction activities do not conflict with mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for plants and wildlife); (b) Review/designate the construction area in the field with the contractor and the County inspector in accordance with the final approved grading plan. Haul roads and access roads should be sited within grading areas to minimize degradation of habitat adjacent to these areas. If activities outside these limits are necessary, they should be evaluated by the biologist to ensure no special-status species or habitat will be affected; (c) Supervise cordoning of preserved natural areas that lie outside grading areas identified in CEQA documentation (e.g., with temporary fence posts and colored rope); (d) Conduct a field review of the staking (to be set by the surveyor) designating the limits of all construction activity. Any construction activity areas immediately adjacent to riparian areas or other special-status resources (such as oak trees, rare plants, or bird nests) may be flagged or temporarily fenced by the monitor, at his/her discretion; (e) Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas. The monitor should also discuss procedures for minimizing harm/harassment of wildlife encountered during construction; (f) Periodically visit the site during construction to coordinate and monitor compliance with the above provisions.

10. Construction personnel shall be prohibited from entry into areas outside the designated construction area, except for necessary construction related activities, such as surveying. All such construction activities shall be coordinated with the construction environmental monitor.
11. Equipment shall not be operated in areas of ponded or flowing water without approval of the Army Corps, Fish and Game, and/or USFWS. Requests for work in these areas must contain a biological evaluation demonstrating that no sensitive fish, amphibians, reptiles and/or birds are currently present, or likely to be present during construction, at the construction site, or along access roads. No construction activities within riparian resources shall be allowed without prior approval by the biological monitor in accordance with approved grading plans.
12. Temporary sediment retention ponds shall be constructed downstream of construction sites that are located in the creekbed when the following circumstances apply: (1) the construction site contains flowing or ponded water that drains off-site into the undisturbed streamflow or ponds; or (2) streamflow is diverted around the construction site, but the work is occurring in the period November 1st through April 15th, when storm flows could inundate the construction site. The sediment ponds shall be constructed of creekbed material. The ponds shall be maintained and repaired after flooding events, and shall be

restored to pre-construction grades and substrate conditions within 30 days after construction has ended. Any disturbance to riparian vegetation resulting from construction of sediment ponds shall be documented by the biologist and a report submitted to the County, CDFG, and ACOE and any adverse effects will be mitigated as detailed in Measures 4.31-4.3-3.

13. If a stream channel has been altered during construction, the low flow channel shall be returned as nearly as practical to pre-project topographic conditions without creating a possible future bank erosion problem. The gradient of the streambed shall be returned to pre-project grade, to the extent practical, unless such operation is part of a restoration project, in which case, the change in grade must be approved by the Army Corps prior to project commencement unless it is specified as a restoration area. All disturbances to riparian resources from temporary stream channel alteration shall be documented by the biological monitor and reported to the County and ACOE and any adverse effects mitigated as detailed in Measures 4.3-1 - 4.3-3.
14. Staging/storage areas for construction equipment and materials shall be located outside of the creek and associated riparian habitat areas.
15. Construction activities shall be limited to the following areas of disturbance: (1) 60 feet on either side of the outer edge of the proposed Decoro Drive Bridge; and (2) 50-foot-wide corridor for all utility lines within or proximate to San Francisquito Creek. The locations of these temporary construction sites and the routes of all access roads shall be shown on construction maps. Any variation from these limits shall be noted, with a justification for a variation. The construction plans shall indicate what type of vegetation, if any, would be disturbed. Revegetation activities shall be in compliance with Measures 4.3-1 - 4.3-3.
16. Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated within or adjacent to the creek channel shall be checked and maintained daily, to prevent leaks of materials that if introduced to water could be deleterious to aquatic life. No equipment maintenance shall be conducted within the creek channel or within 50 feet of this channel. Maintenance of stationary equipment shall be allowed at the construction site within the creek channel provided that drip pans are utilized and measures are taken to ensure that no petroleum products spill from the drip pans. Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders, located within the creekbed construction zone shall be positioned over drip pans. Any accidental spills of petroleum products shall be immediately reported to CDFG, ACOE, USFWS, and other appropriate agencies. Any necessary clean-up measures will be promptly initiated.
17. To reduce the impact of runoff into San Francisquito Creek during construction. Best Management Practices shall be implemented during construction activities to control erosion and sedimentation. When construction timing permits, grading should be conducted during the dry season months to minimize the potential of

adverse impacts to downstream habitats. Grading during the rainy season months shall utilize erosion/siltation control devices which may include, but are not limited to, hay bales, sedimentation rolls, diversion barriers, and sandbags. To reduce the impacts of runoff during project operation, measures included as conditions of the NPDES permit shall be implemented.

18. Standard dust control measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts on nearby plants and wildlife. This includes watering active grading sites at least twice daily; suspending all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds exceed 25 mph; and restricting traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less in areas within 200 feet of vegetation.
19. Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall restore all haul roads and access roads that are outside of approved grading limits. This restoration shall be done in consultation with the biologist construction monitor and reviewed and approved by the County.
20. To minimize direct and indirect disturbance to "waters of the U.S.," an Army Corps Section 404 permit, pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act, will be necessary for fill of jurisdictional habitat. This includes fill and other impacts associated with Decoro Drive Bridge, water treatment and filter facilities, and the proposed trail. In addition, a streambed alteration agreement shall be executed with Fish and Game pursuant to Section 1603 of the California Fish and Game Code for construction and maintenance activities that will disturb or alter the streambed or associated riparian vegetation. Mitigation measures identified by the agencies through these two permitting processes are expected to include all or portions of mitigation measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-24. These measures will include the creation of an oxbow pond similar to that being filled for the placement of abutments for Decoro Drive Bridge. Creation of another ox-bow pond is possible within existing marginal portions of the channel, either above or below the Decoro Drive Bridge crossing. Appropriate soils and hydrology studies shall be conducted to maximize the success of pond creation. The existing pond would be the model for the mitigation pond to be constructed in the creek. Creation of a similarly-aligned ox-bow channel, terminating at the margin of the main creek alluvium, should approximate the conditions under which the existing pond has persisted. Riparian and wetland vegetation occurring at the existing pond shall be planted around the created pond.
21. Access to San Francisquito Creek, as well as within the preserved setback area, shall be prohibited with fencing, signage, planted materials, or other means for pedestrians, domestic pets, and all recreational vehicles including bicycles, motorcycles, and off-road vehicles. Specific actions to restrict access shall include, among other things, posting signs identifying an ecological sensitive area, promoting public education and awareness of such ecological sensitivities, coordinating with Los Angeles County on the placement of trails and public

access routes to and along the creek to avoid conflicts with sensitive biological resources, and the maintenance of fences and barricades to prevent unauthorized or unrestricted access to the creekbed.

22. Exotic and non-native plant species planted as part of landscaping could potentially invade adjacent natural open space areas and displace native species, as such, the project applicant shall prepare landscape design guidelines that describe adverse ecological effects associated with non-native, invasive plants. These guidelines shall be used during the review and approval process by the County for all landscaping plans. Disposal of cuttings of any ornamental plants in on-site or off-site open space areas shall be strictly prohibited.
23. Removal of non-native species such as giant cane (*Arundo donax*), salt cedar, tamarisk (*Tamarix sp.*), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), and castor bean (*Ricinus communis*) from preserved upland and riparian areas shall be included in a revegetation plan to be reviewed and approved by the County to mitigate impacts, and shall be subject to the following standards: (a) First priority shall be given to those habitat patches that support or have a high potential for supporting special-status species; (b) All non-native species removals shall be conducted according to a resource agency approved exotics removal program. Removal of non-native species in patches of native habitat shall be conducted in such a way as to minimize impacts to the existing native riparian plant species.
24. Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall be held responsible to restore any haul roads and access roads that are outside of approved grading limits. This restoration shall be done in consultation with the biologist construction monitor.
25. Non-native plants that are potentially invasive via airborne seeds, or that are particularly difficult to control once escaped, should be prohibited from all parts of the project. A list of the plants to be prohibited shall be prepared and reviewed by the County.
26. Where night lighting occurs on the project site, the following measures shall apply: (a) Night lighting shall be directed onto the property and shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas, as coordinated with the lighting engineer and the project biologist; (b) Exterior lighting shall not exceed a maximum of 0.5 horizontal foot candles at a distance of 25 feet beyond the property boundary. No exterior lighting shall exceed 30 feet in height and direct light and glare shall not be observable at an angle greater than 85 degrees from the nadir of the vertical axis of the light source.
27. Whenever practical, repairs to Decoro Drive Bridge shall be made from the bridge deck. If this is not practical, minimum encroachment upstream and/or downstream of the bridge will occur. The maintenance work area for structural repairs shall be limited to 30 feet on either side of the bridge and under the bridge itself. Equipment shall be introduced into the creekbed by means of an

earth ramp constructed on the sideslope in the immediate vicinity, or from an adjacent invert access ramp if within 1,000 feet of the bridge. If the equipment must access the creekbed, care will be taken to minimize impacts to vegetation and to avoid destruction of large trees, defined as trees with trunks in excess of four inches in diameter at breast height (dbh), measured at four and one-half feet above grade. Any loss of riparian vegetation shall be replaced as per Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-3.

Vehicles and equipment shall be routed to avoid, to the extent feasible, riparian vegetation, live streams, and wetted areas. The boundaries of the maintenance site and any temporary access roads within the creekbed shall be surveyed and marked in the field with stakes and flagging. No maintenance activities, vehicular access, equipment storage, stockpiling, or human intrusion shall occur outside the work area and access roads. If flowing or ponded water is located within the maintenance site (including stream diversions and sediment retention ponds) and access roads, the procedures described above in measure 4.3-8 to identify and relocate special-status fish species from live streams or ponded water shall be followed. If maintenance work in these areas would occur during the riparian bird breeding and nesting season (February 1 through August 1), then appropriate bird nest surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and as described under mitigation measure 4.3-5. A biological monitor shall be on the site during all maintenance activities that would occur within or adjacent to the creek and riparian resources. Reports shall be submitted to the Department of Regional Planning prior to and after each maintenance activity occurrence.

28. At least one month prior to initiation of grading activities, pre-construction trapping will be conducted to minimize the potential direct and indirect loss of special-status reptile species and fossorial mammation species of limited mobility. Methods of trapping can include use of drift fences, pitfall traps, and other similar trapping techniques as deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist. The trapping shall occur at a time of year deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist. All captured specimens shall be released into appropriate habitat adjacent to, but outside of, areas to be graded. Captured specimens of non-native fauna shall not be released back into the wild. All capture records shall be submitted to the Department of Fish and Game.
29. Prior to further grading or other site preparation activities, the applicant shall retain the services of a qualified biologist to prepare a plan for the creation of a habitat area on the southeast portion of the project site outside of the project's development footprint. The actual habitat area site design and location shall be approved by the County and CDFG and consist of a shallow excavated rainpool(s) utilizing a suitable pond liner as a base. The habitat area location shall be as far away as possible from any of the existing or future development areas, including roads and trails, and the location shall be at least the size of the largest occupied area observed on the site. The rainpool(s) shall be designed

such that it only supports standing water for several weeks following seasonal rains such that aquatic predators (i.e., fish, bullfrog, crayfish, etc.) cannot become established.

30. The qualified biologist shall monitor said habitat area for a period of five years, or as otherwise directed by the County and CDFG. Specific monitoring requirements and success criteria shall be approved by the County and CDFG. It is expected that minimum requirements will include annual monitoring during and immediately following peak breeding season such that surveys can be conducted for calling adults as well as for egg masses, larval and post larval toads. Further, survey data will be provided to the regulatory agencies by the monitoring biologist following each monitoring period and a written report summarizing the monitoring results will be provided to the regulatory agencies at the end of the monitoring effort. Success criteria for the monitoring program shall include verifiable evidence of toad reproduction at said habitat area.

(3) Visual Qualities

Potential Effects: The change in character of the project site would represent replacement of open space and agricultural uses with urban uses, but it is not an unavoidable significant impact because such uses already occur immediately surrounding the project site and because the project preserves the major land form features that characterize views of the site from surrounding lands. However, bridge construction and associated stabilization at the creek edge is a significant alteration to the usual character of the creek itself.

Finding: The impacts identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval and design features incorporated into the project will reduce, to the extent feasible, the adverse environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), and in that the following measures will partially mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Where residential or commercial structures are sited along highways, building heights and rooflines shall be varied and trees and other landscaping shall be planted to soften the silhouette of buildings and to blend them into the natural terrain.
2. The project shall comply with the Los Angeles County Hillside Design Guidelines.
3. Graded slopes shall be landscaped, irrigated and permanently maintained.
4. Large graded slopes located along highways or visible from Interstate 5 shall be contoured by varying the slope increments.

5. Fencing or walls, where used, shall be designed to be compatible with the adjoining architectural theme, and shall be of a consistent design within the neighborhood or commercial site.

(4) Solid Waste Disposal

Potential Effects: Implementation of the proposed project would generate, under a worst case scenario which assumes no recycling, approximately 5,217 tons of solid waste per year. Alternative solid waste disposal technologies may reduce landfill disposal, but it has not been demonstrated that approved landfill space or other disposal alternatives will be adequate to serve existing and future uses for the foreseeable future.

Finding: The impacts identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval incorporated into the project will reduce, to the extent feasible, the adverse environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), and in that the following measures will partially mitigate the identified impacts:

1. Recycling bins for glass, metals, paper, wood, plastic, greenwastes, and cardboard shall be placed on construction sites for use by construction workers.
2. In construction specification and bid packages, building materials shall be required to be made of recycled materials, to the extent feasible and economically practical.
3. Recycling/separation areas shall be located in close proximity to dumpsters for non-recyclables, and in elevators, on loading docks, and at primary internal and external access points.
4. Recycling/separation areas shall be located so they are not in conflict with any applicable federal, state or local laws relating to fire, building, access, transportation, circulation, or safety.
5. Recycling/separation areas shall be located so they are convenient for those persons who deposit, collect, and load the recyclable materials.
6. Recycling containers/bins shall be placed so that they do not block access to each other.
7. Solid waste collection/recycling areas shall be compatible with nearby structures, secure, protected against adverse environmental conditions, clearly marked, adequate in capacity, number and distribution, and contain a sufficient number of bins, to serve the recycling needs of the development.
8. Collection/recycling areas shall be designed and constructed to accommodate front-loader packing trucks, including maneuvering room.

9. Driveways and/or travel aisles shall be designed and constructed with adequate width and maneuverability space for unobstructed garbage collection vehicle access and clearance.
10. Signs shall be posted at all access points of the recycling areas that clearly identify all recycling and solid waste collection and loading areas and the materials accepted therein.

(5) Agriculture

Potential Effects: Implementation of the proposed project would convert to urban use 77 acres of land exhibiting characteristics associated with prime farmland. None of the acreage is currently in cultivation.

Finding: The conversion of prime agricultural land is irreversible and is, therefore, generally considered an unavoidable significant impact. The impacts identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Section 6), which is simultaneously being adopted for the project.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

(1) Potential Cumulative Effect on Air Quality: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, will have a significant cumulative impact upon air quality. The related projects as identified in the West Creek EIR, together with the project, will result in an increase in construction-related and operation-related emissions.

Finding: The significant cumulative impacts on air quality identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will reduce, to the extent feasible, the project's contribution to the significant environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), in that the measures set forth in Section 2, above, will mitigate the identified project specific impacts and in that mitigation measures are or will be required for the related projects to reduce their individual contributions to the significant cumulative air quality impacts.

(2) Potential Cumulative Effect on Biota: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, will have a significant cumulative impact upon biological resources. The related projects as identified in the West Creek EIR, together with the project, will result in a loss of riparian habitat as part of the San Francisquito Creek ecosystem, the increase in human and domestic animal use of riparian and

upland habitat areas; the loss of upland/creek wildlife movement corridors and consequent habitat fragmentation; and the net loss of wildlife habitat.

Finding: The significant cumulative impacts on biological resources identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will reduce, to the extent feasible, the project's contribution to the significant environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), in that the measures set forth in Section 2, above, will mitigate the identified project specific impacts and in that mitigation measures are or will be required for the related projects to reduce their individual contributions to the significant cumulative biological resource impacts.

(3) Potential Cumulative Effect on Visual Qualities: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, will have a significant cumulative impact upon visual qualities. The related projects as identified in the West Creek EIR, together with the project, will result in a change in visual character from rural/open space to one more urban.

Finding: The significant cumulative impacts on visual qualities identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However, conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will reduce, to the extent feasible, the project's contribution to the significant environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), in that the measures set forth in Section 2, above, will mitigate the identified project specific impacts and in that mitigation measures are or will be required for the related projects to reduce their individual contributions to the significant cumulative visual quality impacts.

(4) Potential Cumulative Effect on Solid Waste Disposal: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, will have a significant cumulative impact upon solid waste disposal. Even though there are several landfill expansion plans in various stages of the permit review process, the related projects as identified in the West Creek EIR, together with the project, could result in an oversupply of solid waste until such time as the County can demonstrate that approved landfill space or other disposal alternates will be adequate to serve existing and future uses for the foreseeable future.

Finding: The significant cumulative impacts on solid waste disposal identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance. However,

conditions of approval and features incorporated into the project design will reduce, to the extent feasible, the project's contribution to the significant environmental effects.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6), in that the measures set forth in Section 2, above, will mitigate the identified project specific impacts and in that mitigation measures are or will be required for the related projects to reduce their individual contributions to the significant cumulative solid waste disposal impacts.

(5) Potential Cumulative Effect on Agricultural Resources: A number of development projects are pending or approved in the vicinity of the project site. The effects of those projects, in conjunction with the project, will have a significant cumulative impact upon agricultural resources. The related projects as identified in the West Creek EIR, together with the project, will result in a conversion of agricultural land to urban uses.

Finding: The significant cumulative impacts on agricultural resources identified in the West Creek EIR cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance and no feasible mitigation exists.

Facts: The above finding is made in conjunction with a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is simultaneously being adopted for the project (see Section 6).

SECTION 3

GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

CEQA identifies a project as growth-inducing (i.e., a project involving spatial, economic or population growth in a geographic area) if it could foster economic or population growth or construction of additional housing either directly or indirectly.

Finding: The proposed project meets a growth-inducing criterion specified under CEQA, and, therefore, the proposed project may be considered growth-inducing.

Facts: The following facts support the above finding:

(1) Removal of an Impediment to Growth

Construction of water, sewer and energy-related infrastructure is required to support buildout of the project. The water distribution system includes improvements that are intended to complete the existing Zone I water service zone, which extends beyond the project boundaries. Similarly, development of the project would necessitate construction of a sewer trunk line that would establish sewer service not only to the project, but also to adjacent proposed development. This design and construction of water and sewer infrastructure needed to accommodate buildout of the project could potentially induce growth within undeveloped areas surrounding the project.

An established transportation network presently exists in the project area which affords the property access to the community of Valencia and the City of Santa Clarita.

Copper Hill Drive will help create a continuous regional alternative north-south access route to I-5. Copper Hill Drive has already been constructed. Moreover, none of the collector roadways planned on the project site are directed to vacant land which has not been approved for development and the construction of the Decoro Drive Bridge would not provide access to land that presently cannot be reached. Therefore, development of the project's circulation network would not induce growth on surrounding property as the project would not significantly improve access to undeveloped parcels.

(2) Economic Expansion or Growth

The proposed project could potentially induce growth by introducing additional short-term employment opportunities from construction of the project site. Some of the new temporary employment opportunities provided by this project could induce a small number of people to move into the Santa Clarita Valley. It is, therefore, expected that this new population could induce incremental secondary growth in the local or regional area. However, given this project's relatively small size in relation to the area's regional population and work force, the economic condition of this project alone would not be considered significant. Also, the proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the County General Plan, proposes a similar site population to that which would occur under current Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan designations and is, therefore, a component of the overall population growth already planned for the Santa Clarita Valley by both Los Angeles County and the Southern California Association of Governments. Nonetheless, despite such consistency, the small increase in economic activity potentially generated by the proposed project would be growth inducing.

(3) Precedent Setting Action

Approval of this project will require an amendment to the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, a zone change, tract map and conditional use permits approvals. However, amending the existing Area Plan land use designations for the project site to permit development of the project as proposed would not foster similar amendment requests on properties located in proximity to the project site because the Area Plan already permits a similar level of development on the site to that proposed as part of this project.

(4) Development of Open Space

The proposed project site is situated in an area that is proximal to existing urbanized uses in the Santa Clarita Valley (i.e., Valencia Industrial Center, Valencia High School, the Lockheed industrial facility and other approved developments and a large intervening open space would not be created. The project site is also located in the vicinity of established and planned roadways. Given these factors, the project would not induce growth under this criterion as it would not result in the urbanization of land in an isolated locality.

SECTION 4

FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the proposed project described in the Draft EIR were analyzed and considered. The alternatives discussed in the West Creek EIR constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The West Creek EIR concluded that the 60 percent Reduced Density/Modified Site Plan Alternative was the environmentally superior alternative. However, the Board does not select this alternative, and instead recommends the proposed project with the West Creek EIR mitigation measures. Consequently, in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is hereby adopted (see Section 6) to substantiate the County's decision to reject the environmentally superior alternative because of the benefits afforded by the project as well as other reasons set forth in Section 6.

Alternative 1 - The "No Project" Alternative

Description of Alternative: This alternative is required by the CEQA Guidelines, and it discusses the existing conditions, without any development, as well as comparing the impacts which might occur if this particular project is not approved but the site otherwise develops based on present plans and infrastructure constraints, with those impacts that would be generated by the project as proposed. There are two no project alternatives; 1a, that which could reasonably be expected to occur under the current Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan; and 1b, that which could reasonably be expected to occur under the current A-2-5 zoning restrictions of the Los Angeles County Code.

"No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" Comparison of Effects: The "No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" alternative would eliminate some of the environmental impacts of the project. However, the "No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" would not provide the beneficial effects of the project because there are various methods of grading, bank stabilization and development envelopes which could be used to develop the property. It would limit the range of housing opportunities provided and not meet the array of housing needs projected for the Santa Clarita Valley. In addition, peak hour traffic conditions would be exacerbated along local roadways as other new development is constructed without the benefit of the construction of the Decoro Drive Bridge.

Buildout of the project under the alternative would result in higher density and environmental impacts than the proposed project.

Buildout of the project site under present plans would result in higher density and environmental impacts than the proposed project.

"No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" Finding: The "No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" alternative is not preferred because this alternative fails to meet many of the objectives of the proposed project as identified in the West Creek EIR or to provide an/of the benefits of the proposed project as set forth herein.

"No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" Facts: The above finding is made in that the "No Project - Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan" alternative would not (1) create needed housing opportunities that are compatible with existing and planned residential developments adjacent to the project, (2) provide a range of housing types to meet the demand for additional housing, or (3) designate sites for needed public facilities, (4) provide for the construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, a transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance, (5) provide for a range of recreational opportunities or (6) develop the project site in the manner proposed by the applicant. The project site is well suited to the proposed development.

"No Project - Los Angeles County Code" Comparison of Effects: The "No Project - Los Angeles County Code" alternative would eliminate many of the environmental impacts of the project. However, it would narrowly limit the range of housing opportunities provided on the site, would not meet the array of housing needs projected for the Santa Clarity Valley, and could have a greater impact on biotic resources.

"No Project - Los Angeles County Code" Findings: The "No Project - Los Angeles County Code" alternative is not preferred because this alternative fails to meet many of the objectives of the proposed project as identified in the West Creek EIR or 10 provide any of the benefits of the proposed project as set forth herein.

"No Project - Los Angeles County Code" Facts: The "No Project - Los Angeles County Code" alternative would not (1) create needed housing opportunities that are compatible with existing and planned residential developments adjacent to the project, (2) provide a range of housing types 10 meet the demand for additional housing, or (3) designate sites for needed public facilities, (4) provide for the construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, a transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance, (5) provide for a range of recreational opportunities, or (6) provide a tax base to support public services, (7) develop the project in the manner proposed by the Applicant. The project site is well suited to the proposed development.

Alternative 2 - 20 Percent Reduced Density Alternative

Description of Alternative: This alternative would introduce 1,325 single family residential units, 723 multi-family units, 145,000 square feet of commercial space and private recreational facilities to the site. This alternative represents a development proposal similar in overall design and layout to the proposed project but reduced in scale from the project addressed in the West Creek EIR .

Comparison of Effects: Alternative 2 would generally result in less severe environmental impacts than the project. The alternative, though, would have a greater impact on population and housing, exacerbating a projected future jobs/housing imbalance. Decoro Drive Bridge would also not be included in the project because it would not be economically feasible.

Finding: This alternative was not selected because it would not meet either applicant's objectives or the County objectives regarding infrastructure/transportation.

Facts: While certain environmental impacts are avoided or lessened, several of the basic objectives of the proposed project are not fully met or are impeded, and some benefits associated with the project would not be maximized as follows:

1. Alternative 2 would not provide for construction of the Decoro Drive Bridge, a major transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance.
2. Alternative 2 would not create as many construction-related jobs or generate as much real property tax revenues.
3. Alternative 2 would not allow the applicant to earn a reasonable return on investment and hence is not feasible.

Alternative 3 - 60 Percent Reduced Density/Modified Site Plan

Description of Alternative: This alternative would introduce 718 single family residential units, 300 multi-family units, 72,000 gross square feet of commercial space and private recreational facilities on the site. This alternative compares the impacts of a development proposal which is substantially reduced in scale and modified in design from the project addressed in the West Creek EIR. The Decoro Drive Bridge would not be built as part of this alternative.

Comparison of Effects: The magnitude of most of the environmental impacts of the project would be reduced with Alternative 3. The alternative, though, would have a greater impact on population and housing, reducing the range of residential opportunities and exacerbating a projected future jobs/housing imbalance. Decoro Drive Bridge would also not be included in the project because it would not be economically feasible.

Finding: This alternative was not selected because it would not meet either applicant's objectives or the County objectives regarding housing demands and transportation infrastructure, nor does it have several of the benefits associated with the project.

Facts: While many environmental impacts are avoided or lessened, several basic objectives of the proposed project are not fully met or are impeded, and some benefits associated with the project would not be maximized as follows:

1. Alternative 3 would impede or not fully meet the objective of providing a range of housing types and housing prices to meet the demand for additional housing.
2. Alternative 3 would impede or not fully meet the objective of providing a tax base necessary to support public service.
3. Alternative 3 would not provide for construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, a major transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance.

4. Alternative 3 would not allow the applicant to earn a reasonable return on investment and hence is not feasible.

Alternative 4 - Alternative Use Mix

Description of Alternative: This alternative would develop approximately 6 million square feet of industrial uses on the Property. The Decoro Drive Bridge would not be included in the project.

Comparison of Effects: Alternative 4 would result in a greater level of impact than the proposed project in traffic/access, noise, air quality, wastewater disposal, and solid waste disposal. Impacts would be less, however, in geotechnical resources, biota, and water resources. Because there is no residential use associated with this alternative, impacts generally more associated with the needs of residential development would also decrease: education, public safety services and libraries. Impacts in remaining areas would be similar to the proposed project. Decoro Drive Bridge would not be included as a part of this alternative because it would not be economically feasible.

Finding: This alternative was not selected because it would not be environmentally preferred over the project, nor does it have several of the benefits associated with the project.

Facts: The environmental impacts of this alternative are similar to or greater than those of the project in many respects, and this alternative does not have several of the benefits associated with the project, nor does it meet applicant objectives or County objectives as follows:

1. Alternative 4 would impede or not fully meet the objective of creating a community that allows for residential and commercial development while preserving significant natural resources and open space.
2. Alternative 4 would not meet the objective of providing a range of housing types and housing prices to meet the demand for additional housing.
3. Alternative 4 would impede or not fully meet the objective of providing for a range of recreational activities and the recreational use of open space in a manner compatible with protection of significant natural resources.
4. Alternative 4 would impede or not fully meet the objective of designating sites for public facilities.
5. Alternative 4 would not provide for construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, a major transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance.

Alternative 5 - Widening Bridge Span

Description of Alternative: This alternative is identical to the proposed project in land use mix and intensity, but compares the impacts of a development proposal

which pulls the Decoro Drive Bridge abutment 500 feet to the west of the current location.

Comparison of Effects: This alternative would reduce potentially significant biota-related impacts of the project since it would avoid the loss of some habitat and there would also be less constriction of water flow at this location as the footprint of the bridge abutments within the creek would be removed. However, widening of the bridge span would increase the cost of bridge construction to a point where it is no longer economically practical for the applicant to construct the bridge as part of the project. This alternative would also not be consistent with design requirements and environmental balancing at other bridges in the same area.

Finding: This alternative was not selected because it would not meet applicant objectives or County objectives and would not have some of the benefits associated with the project.

Facts: While the environmental impacts of the Alternative are similar to the proposed project, objectives of the proposed project are not fully met or are impeded and some of the benefits of the project would not be maximized as follows:

1. Alternative 5 would not feasibly provide for construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, a major transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance, because the cost of the Bridge as designed in the Alternative would increase to the point where it would no longer be economically practical for the applicant to construct the bridge as part of the project.

Alternative 6 - SEA Compatible Alternative

Description of Alternative: This alternative would introduce 1,872 single family dwelling units, 216 multi-family units, 180,000 square feet of commercial space and private recreational facilities to the site. Site development under this alternative pulls development further away from the Creek and would involve the creation of a wildlife corridor through re-vegetation of the existing SCE easements and MWD fee property. This corridor would link habitat found within San Francisquito Creek to upland habitat in the interior of the project site. The Decoro Drive Bridge would not be included in the project.

Comparison of Effects: Because the intensity of development is somewhat less than that of the proposed project, this alternative would slightly reduce impacts in noise, air quality, biota, wastewater disposal, solid waste disposal, education, public safety services, libraries, recreation, utilities and population and housing. Biological benefits would be limited to the presence of existing or planned development surrounding the proposed project site.

Finding: This alternative was not selected because it would not meet applicant objectives or County objectives and would not have some of the benefits associated with the project.

Facts: While the environmental impacts of the Alternative are similar to the proposed project, objectives of the proposed project are not fully met or are impeded and some of the benefits of the project would not be maximized as follows:

1. Alternative 6 would not provide for construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, a transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance.

SECTION 5

FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that when a public agency is making the findings required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), codified as Section 2081(a) of the Public Resources Code, the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval, in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

The Board hereby finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Program, which is attached as Exhibit A to these Findings, and incorporated in the West Creek project's Conditional Use Permit, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of project conditions intended to mitigate potential environmental effects.

SECTION 6

STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement, identified and discussed potentially significant effects, which will occur as a result of the West Creek project. With the implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the West Creek EIR, as revised, these effects can be mitigated to levels of insignificance except for significant unavoidable project impacts on air quality, biota, visual qualities, solid waste disposal and agriculture and except for significant unavoidable cumulative impacts on air quality, biota, visual qualities, solid waste disposal and agriculture, as identified in Section 2 of these findings.

Having reduced the significant adverse environmental effects of the West Creek project by approving the project and adopting the conditions of approval and the mitigation measures identified in the West Creek EIR, and having balanced the benefits of the project against the project's potential unavoidable significant adverse impacts, the Board hereby determines that the benefits of the project outweigh the potential unavoidable significant adverse impacts, and that the unavoidable significant adverse impacts are nonetheless acceptable, based on the following overriding considerations:

1. The project will provide a range of quality housing opportunities, including both single family units and multi-family units, as well as on site recreation areas and landscaped areas, that meet projected housing needs in the Santa Clarita Valley.

2. The project will provide commercial/retail space to meet commercial space needs in the Santa Clarita Valley and future residents of the project.
3. The project will provide for the construction of Decoro Drive Bridge, an important transportation infrastructure improvement with regional significance, which is shown on the Los Angeles County Master Plan of Highways.
4. The project will provide off-site roadway and intersection improvements to the arterial highway system in a manner consistent with the County Plan of Highways.
5. The project will provide paseos within the project site adjacent to Copper Hill Drive and along certain residential collector streets and easements that will link with and be a part of the much larger paseo network system planned for the North River area and Valencia.
6. The project will provide a public hiking/hiking trail which will implement a 12,000 linear foot segment of the proposed Los Angeles County San Francisquito Canyon Trail, which will provide a regional benefit.
7. During construction of the project, construction related jobs will be created. Approximately 497 permanent jobs will also be created by the project.
8. The project will provide permanent erosion control measures which will reduce site sedimentation and debris volume generation resulting in a beneficial impact on water quality.

SECTION 7

SECTION 15091 AND 15092 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, the Board has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant adverse effects of the project:

- (a) Changes or alternations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid many of the significant environmental effects thereof as identified in the West Creek EIR.
- (b) Some changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (c) Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the West Creek EIR.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, and as conditioned by the foregoing.

- (a) All significant effects on the environment due to the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.
- (b) Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the overriding considerations set forth in the foregoing Statement of Overriding Considerations.

SECTION 8

SECTION 21082.1(C)(3) FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resource Code §21082.1(c)(3), the Board hereby finds that the West Creek EIR, as revised by the Final Additional Analysis and Supplement, reflects the independent judgment of the lead agency.

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION The Mitigation Monitoring Program describes the procedures the applicant and others will use to implement the mitigation measures adopted in connection with the approval of the proposed project and the methods of monitoring such actions. A Monitoring Program is necessary only for impacts which would be significant if not mitigated. The following consists of a monitoring program table noting the responsible agency for mitigation monitoring, the schedule and a list of all project-related mitigation measures.

PURPOSE *The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) has been prepared in conformance with Section 21081.6 of the California Environmental Quality Act. It is the intent of this program to: (1) verify satisfaction of the required mitigation measures of the EIR; (2) provide a methodology to document implementation of the required mitigation; (3) provide a record of the Monitoring Program; (4) identify monitoring responsibility; (5) establish administrative procedures for the clearance of mitigation measures; (6) establish the frequency and duration of monitoring; and (7) utilize existing review processes wherever feasible.*

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1	GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES						
4.1-1	The project would be graded in accordance with the Hillside Design Guidelines published by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (December 1987).	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section, and Building and Safety		Ongoing during grading activities.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section		Mass grading underway for Area C.
				3.	Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans		

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-2	The location and dimensions of the exploratory trenches and borings shall be noted relative to future building plans, unless the trenches and/or borings are removed by future grading operations. If future foundations do traverse the trenches or borings, they shall be evaluated by the Project Soils Engineer for mitigation measures relative to potential settlement.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Approval of Final Building Plans	Los Angeles County approved a bulk grading plan (Permit No. 0820 0204160002) for VTTM 52455 on September 4, 2002.
4.1-3	Nine estate lots have been proposed on Lots 366 to 374. No grading has been proposed in the area of these lots. Any future development of these lots will require a geologic/geotechnical investigation and report.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans	Los Angeles County approved a bulk grading plan (Permit No. 0820 0204160002) for VTTM 52455 on September 4, 2002.
4.1-4	An alternate (school pad) grading concept may occur in the vicinity of Lots 433-478, which would consist of lowering proposed grades (that range from 1385 to 1335) for Lots 433 to 478 to 1368 to 1330 for the school pad. If and when it is decided to convert Lots 433 to 478 into an elementary school, specific recommendations relative to slope stability will be addressed at that time.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans	Los Angeles County approved a bulk grading plan (Permit No. 0820 0204160002) for VTTM 52455 on September 4, 2002.
4.1-5	Areas that are to receive compacted fill shall be observed by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm prior to the placement of fill.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-6	All drainage devices shall be properly installed and observed by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. and/or owner's representative(s) prior to placement of backfill.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-7	Fill shall be placed in controlled layers (lifts), the thickness of which is compatible with the type of compaction equipment used. The thickness of the compacted fill layer shall be adjusted to obtain proper compaction with the equipment used, and generally shall not exceed an allowable thickness of 8 inches. Each layer shall be compacted to a minimum compaction of 90 percent relative to the maximum dry density determined per the latest ASTM D1557 test. Density testing shall be performed by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm to verify relative compaction. The Contractor shall provide proper access and level areas for testing.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Final Grading Plans	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-8	Where space limitations do not allow for conventional fill compaction operations, special backfill materials and procedures may be required. Pea gravel or other select fill can be used in areas of limited space. A sand and portland cement slurry (2 sacks per cubic-yard mix) shall be used in limited space areas for shallow backfill near final pad grade, and pea gravel shall be placed in deeper backfill near drainage systems.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Grading Plans	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)							
4.1-9	Fill soils shall consist of imported soils or on site soils free of organics, cobbles, and deleterious material and shall be approved by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm. Rocks larger than 6 inches in diameter shall not be used unless they are sufficiently broken down. All imported soil shall be granular, non-expansive, with an Expansion Index (EI) less than 30. Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm shall evaluate and/or test the import material for its conformance with the specifications prior to its delivery to the site. The Contractor shall notify the geotechnical engineering firm 72 hours prior to importing material to the site.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Building Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-10	Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm shall observe the placement of compacted fill and conduct in-place field density tests on the compacted fill to check for adequate moisture content and the required relative compaction. Where less than specified relative compaction is indicated, additional compactive effort shall be applied and the soil moisture conditioned as necessary until adequate relative compaction is attained.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Building Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-11	The Contractor shall comply with the minimum relative compaction out to the finish slope face of fill slopes, buttresses, and stabilization fills as set forth in the specifications for compacted fill. This may be achieved by either overbuilding the slope and cutting back as necessary, or by direct compaction of the slope face with suitable equipment, or by any other procedure that produces the required result.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section	2. LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section	3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-12 Any abandoned underground structures, such as cesspools, cisterns, mining shafts, tunnels, septic tanks, wells, pipelines or others not discovered prior to grading, are to be removed or treated to the satisfaction of the Soils Engineer and/or the controlling agency for the project.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-13 The Contractor shall have suitable and sufficient equipment during a particular operation to handle the volume of fill being placed. When necessary, fill placement equipment shall be shut down temporarily in order to permit proper compaction of fills, correction of deficient areas, or to facilitate required field testing.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-14 The Contractor shall be responsible for the satisfactory completion of all earthwork in accordance with the project plans and specifications.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. This issue will also be addressed at a later date prior to the issuance of building permits Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-15 Final reports shall be submitted after completion of earthwork and after the Soils Engineer and Engineering Geologist have finished their observations of the work. No additional excavation or filling shall be performed without prior notification to the Soils Engineer and/or Engineering Geologist.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. This issue will also be addressed at a later date prior to the issuance of building permits. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-16 Whenever the words “supervision,” “inspection” or “control” are used, they shall mean <u>observation</u> of the work and/or testing of the compacted fill by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm to assess whether substantial compliance with plans, specifications and design concepts has been achieved, and does not include direction of the actual work of the Contractor or the Contractor’s workmen.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-17 Trench excavations to receive backfill shall be free of trash, debris or other unsatisfactory materials prior to backfill placement, and shall be observed by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. representative or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-18 Trench backfills shall be compacted to at least a relative compaction of 90 percent. Trench backfills underlying pavements shall be compacted to a minimum relative compaction of 95 percent, to a depth of at least 24 inches below the pavement section. Relative compaction is defined as the ratio of the in-place soil dry density to the laboratory maximum dry density as determined by the ASTM D1557 test method.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-19	Except as stipulated herein, soils obtained from the excavation may be used as backfill if they are essentially free of organics and deleterious materials.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-20	Rocks generated from the trench excavation not exceeding 3 inches in largest dimension may be used as backfill material. However, such material may not be placed within 12 inches of the top of the pipeline. No more than 30 percent of the backfill volume shall contain particles larger than 1.5 inches in diameter, and rocks shall be well mixed with finer soil.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-21	Per County of Los Angeles Guidelines, soils (other than aggregates) with a Sand Equivalent (SE) greater than or equal to 20, as determined by ASTM D2419 Standard Test Method or at the discretion of the engineer or representative in the field, may be used for bedding and shading material in the pipe zone areas. These soils are considered satisfactory for compaction by jetting procedures.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-22	Trench backfill other than bedding and shading shall be compacted by mechanical methods as tamping sheepsfoot, vibrating or pneumatic rollers or other mechanical tampers to achieve the density specified herein. The backfill materials shall be brought to within 3 percent of optimum moisture content, and then placed in horizontal layers with a thickness compatible to the material being placed and the type of equipment being used. Each layer shall be evenly spread, moistened or dried as necessary and then tamped or rolled until the specified density has been achieved.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)							
4.1-23	The Contractor shall select the equipment and process to be used to achieve the specified density without damage to the pipeline, the adjacent ground, existing improvements or completed work.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-24	Observations and field tests shall be carried on during construction by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm to confirm that the required degree of compaction has been obtained. Where compaction is less than that specified, additional compaction effort shall be made with adjustment of the moisture content as necessary until the specified compaction is obtained. Field density tests may be omitted at the discretion of the engineer or his representative in the field.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-25	Whenever, in the opinion of Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or the Owner's Representative(s), an unstable condition is being created by either cutting or filling, the work shall not proceed until an investigation has been made and the excavation plan revised, if deemed necessary.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-26	Fill material shall not be placed, spread, or rolled during unfavorable weather conditions. When the work is interrupted by heavy rain, fill operations shall not be resumed until field tests by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. or another qualified geotechnical engineering firm indicate the moisture content and density of the fill are as specified.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)							
4.1-27	The walls of temporary (construction) trenches for subdrains shall stand vertical provided the trench depth does not exceed 5 feet and heavy equipment is not allowed within 5 feet of the edge of the trench. Where trench alignments are in sloping terrain, vertical trench walls shall not be excavated to depths greater than 4 feet. Shoring of trench walls or flattening of slopes to a 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical) slope or flatter will be required if deeper trenches are necessary or if the presence of gravel pockets, loose sands, weak material or adverse dipping beds indicate a potential for localized raveling or instability.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-28	All work associated with trench shoring shall conform to the State of California, Division of Industrial Safety Code (Cal OSHA).	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-29	The maximum removals of alluvium required are down to 18 feet at CPT-6, CPT-7 and HS-1 and down to 16 feet at CPT-8, CPT-9, HS-2 and HS-3. Recommended removal depths in these areas range from 18 to 20 feet and 16 to 20 feet respectively on the Removal Depths Map (Sheet 1 of 4 of Figure 4.1-1 of the DEIR).	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-30	Recommended alluvial removals in the larger canyons on the site can range from 5 to 20 feet in the same general area.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-31 Alluvial removals shall be performed during the summer months since the deeper recommended removal depths coincide approximately with some of the ground water depths Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. encountered in its exploratory borings, which were drilled in the late winter to early spring 1998.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-32 In proposed graded areas in the smaller canyons and on the slope flanks, all artificial fill, surficial soils, slopewash, loose alluvium and weathered bedrock (TQs and Qt) shall be completely removed to flanks firm bedrock. Recommended removal depths in these narrower canyons typically range from 2 to 10 feet. Isolated “pockets” of deeper removals (greater than 10 feet) will be necessary where warranted. The recommended removal depths are shown on Sheet 1 of 4 of Figure 4.1-1 of the DEIR.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-33 A minimum 3-foot-thick cap fill shall be placed on level cut lots within the Saugus Formation to serve as a relatively impermeable blanket course for impeding seepage of surface runoff into exposed, adversely dipping beds of that formation. The cap fill shall be compacted to the same requirements as the engineered fill. Borrow sources would be from nearby areas of required excavation.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-34 Areas and conditions requiring capping shall be identified by the Geotechnical Engineer or the Engineering Geologist during construction, and the capping recommendation revised as warranted.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, LACFCD, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, LACFCD, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status	
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-35	Excavated material to be used for the construction of site fills shall not contain organic matter, shall have no rock or similar irreducible material with a maximum dimension greater than 6 inches, and shall be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer before use. It will be permissible to selectively place large rock fragments over 6 inches in size within the fill. A description of such selective placement is shown on Figure 3 of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report. Imported material, if required, shall be nonexpansive and predominantly granular and shall be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer before use. Alluvial material may be used in earth fill operations provided that the material is relatively free of organic matter.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, LACFCD, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, LACFCD, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-36	Any oversize boulders, if encountered, may be incorporated into the fill as rock fill in windrows after being reduced to the specified maximum rock fill size (see Figure 3 of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report).	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, LACFCD, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, LACFCD, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-37	Depressions or ruts created in the process of grading operations shall be properly backfilled with suitable fill compacted to not less than 90 percent relative compaction. Where native soil remains, the upper 6 inches of the native soil subgrade exposed during stripping or excavation shall be scarified, moisture-conditioned, and properly compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction prior to fill placement. All fill material shall be placed in uniform lifts not exceeding 8 inches in its loose state and compacted to a minimum of 90 percent relative compaction as determined based on the latest ASTM Test Designation D-1557.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-38 In areas to receive compacted fill, where the surface gradient is steeper than 5:1 (horizontal:vertical), the soil mantle shall be removed and such areas benched horizontally into competent material prior to or in conjunction with fill placement. This would also apply to all backfill placed on landslide excavations slopes. Keys would be required at the toes of embankments and observations shall be provided by the Engineering Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer to determine where these keys are needed. All keys shall be constructed to a minimum of 15 feet in width and 2 feet in depth below subgrade after topsoil removal. Key requirements are depicted in Figure 4, "Fill Slope Over Natural Slope" of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer/ Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-39 Economic and engineering benefits may be derived from the selective use of the site materials. It is therefore considered to be desirable to perform the required grading in the following manner: • Material obtained from excavations in harder bedrock will probably be more granular and shall be placed in the lower portions of fills to minimize settlements and to improve subsurface drainage. These materials, however, shall not substitute for drain blankets and/or subdrains otherwise required. • Where practical, material that is principally clayey shall be placed on the outer portions of fill slopes to minimize erosion and to provide a suitable base to support plant growth. These clayey blankets shall not impede the drainage path of seepage water through the fill.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-39 (cont.)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No adversely inclined layering of clay soils shall be allowed in embankment fills or within sidehill fills over natural ground where ground slope is steeper than 5:1 (horizontal:vertical). Use of material consisting of oversized rock fragments in fills throughout the site shall be avoided within the expected depth-of-trenching for utilities in street areas and generally in the upper 10 feet, as a minimum. Materials suspected of being potentially highly expansive shall be placed in the lower portions of areal fills to minimize potential adverse effects on structures placed on the fills. It shall be noted that all grading operations within MWD's right-of-way are to be reviewed and approved by MWD personnel. Following Grading Plan approval by the MWD, MWD staff shall require stringent conditions of approval and will also make periodic field inspections of the grading operations within MWD right-of-way. 	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-40 No specific building foundation designs are provided at this time. The following general foundation criteria are provided for future design and planning consideration. The proposed grading plan shall generally involve the following foundation support conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foundation support within bedrock in cut areas; Foundation support within engineered fill; and Foundation support within transition zones of cut and fill. 	Applicant (Project Structural Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u> To be addressed at a later date.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)						
4.1-41 Shallow spread footings for foundation support of up to two-story residential, commercial or light industrial developments can adequately be derived from native soils, processed as necessary, and bedrock or engineered fill compacted as recommended herein. Heavier structural support, if applicable, shall be addressed at the Grading Plan stage. Bearing capacity data and lateral resistance of footing walls shall be provided at the Grading Plan stage.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. This issue will also be addressed at a later date prior to the issuance of building permits Mass grading in progress for Area C.
		Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3.	
4.1-42 Retaining wall geotechnical design parameters shall be provided at the Grading Plan stage.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		<u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
		Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3.	
4.1-43 Pavement design recommendations will be provided at the Grading Plan stages.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		<u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
		Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3.	
4.1-44 Figure 7, “Cut Lot (Transitional)” and “Cut-Fill Lot (Transitional)” of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report provides a foundation grading detail for locations where foundations will straddle transition zones of cut and fill. Figure 8 of that report provides overexcavation recommendations at lots where the building is placed over the crest of a natural slope and part of the building would be on compacted fill and part on bedrock. In addition, extra foundation slab reinforcement shall be provided in these cases.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
		Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3.	

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-45 Temporary construction cuts, such as stabilization keyway excavations may be constructed at slopes steeper than 1-1/2:1. Actual geologic and ground water conditions identified for the grading plan stage of the project and also the expected duration of the open face will govern the recommended slope for stability of the cut slope.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-46 An Engineering Geologist shall observe all cut slopes during grading and provide recommendations for necessary modifications.	Applicant (Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-47 The standard setbacks from ascending and descending slopes provided in Section 1806.4 of the 1996 Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code shall be followed, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations.	Applicant (Civil Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division and Geology and Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-48 For proposed Cut-Slope CS-13, the top of the ridge shall be cut to an elevation of 1382 feet or lower, as shown on Cross Section 28-28'.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division and Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
4.1-49 Cut-slopes and fill slopes at the site will be sloped at a 2:1 inclination or flatter. Sandy materials will be susceptible to erosion; therefore, cut and fill slopes shall be sodded or planted, if practicable, as soon as the grading work is completed in order to minimize erosion.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division and Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)							
4.1-50	Benches or terraces at least 8 feet in width shall be established at vertical intervals of not more than 25 feet on all cut or fill slopes to control surface drainage and collect debris. Where only one bench is required, it shall be at mid-height. For cut or fill slopes greater than 100 feet the terrace near mid-height shall not be less than 20 feet in width.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division, Geology/Soils Section	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
			Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division and Geology/Soils Section		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-51	Swales or ditches on all terraces shall have a minimum gradient of 5 percent and shall be paved with gunite, or approved equal. They shall have a minimum depth at the deepest point of 12 inches and a minimum paved width of 8 feet.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
			Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-52	Mitigation for cut slopes shall comply with the requirements identified in the Cut-Slope Summary - Table 2 of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
			Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-53	Cut-slopes less than 25 feet in height with adverse geologic or grading configurations (fill over cut) shall be, if necessary, with a standard 15-foot wide stability fill. A typical stability fill detail is shown on Figure 5 of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
			Field Verification	2.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division and Geology/Soils Section		Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)							
4.1-54	All permanent cut-slopes in both alluvium and bedrock shall be constructed at a slope ratio not steeper than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical).	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section, Building & Safety Division		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section and Building & Safety Division		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		
4.1-55	An Engineering Geologist shall observe all cut slopes during grading and provide recommendations for necessary modifications.	Applicant (Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section, Building & Safety Division		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section and Building & Safety Division		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		
4.1-56	All cut slopes along Copper Hill Drive shall be constructed pursuant to the Grading Plan for the extension of Copper Hill Drive by Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. and R.T. Frankian & Associates, Inc. (see Ref. Nos. 25, 26, 39, 40 and 41 of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report).	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section, Building & Safety Division		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section and Building & Safety Division		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading		
4.1-57	To minimize significant settlements, upper soils in areas to receive fills shall be removed and recompacted to competent materials. No specific foundation design loads are available at this time. The design grades, to be achieved by highest fills, may be placed sufficiently ahead of building construction to induce potential settlements ahead of time.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LACDPW, Building & Safety Division, Geology/ Soils Section		Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
				2.	LACDPW Building & Safety Division and Geology/Soils Section		Mass grading in progress for Area C.
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits		

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-58 Fill slopes shall be constructed at a slope ratio not steeper than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). To minimize the probability of slumping and/or erosion of fill slopes, the faces of such slopes shall be properly treated. Proper compaction of the face shall be accomplished by constructing the fill at least 6 feet (horizontally) beyond the planned final face plane, and compacting to not less than 90 percent relative compaction throughout. The slope face shall then be trimmed back to the final face plane. This operation shall expose properly compacted material on the finished face of the slope.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division and Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-59 In areas where a fill slope will be constructed immediately above a cut slope, the cut slope shall be constructed prior to placement of fill. A setback of at least 6 feet shall be provided between the top of the cut and the toe of the fill. Details of typical fill over cut slope conditions are shown on Figure 6, "Typical Fill Above Cut Slope" of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-60 In areas where fill slopes will be constructed above natural ground, all topsoil and slopewash shall be removed and the fill keyed into firm earth a minimum of 2 feet, measured at the toe of the fill slope, and then benched, as shown on Figure 4, "Fill Slope over Natural Slope" of the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology/ Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-61 All landslide removals shall be completed under continuous observations by the Project Geologist.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-62 Landslide VII is to be mitigated pursuant to measures identified in Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc.'s In-Progress Grading Plan Report for Revised Tract 49400.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-63 Landslide VIII is to be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-64 Landslide IX shall be either removed, or a debris basin large enough to contain its volume shall be designed. Final recommendations relative to this landslide will be determined once the use of Lot 483 is known.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-65 Landslide XI shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-66 Landslide XIII shall be completely removed under continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-67 Landslide XV shall be removed under continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that it is entirely removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-68 Landslide XVI shall be removed under continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-69 Landslide XVII shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-70 Landslide XVIII shall be removed under continuous observations of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-71 Landslide XIX shall be completely removed during grading operations for TT 52455 under the supervision of the Project Engineering Geologist.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-72 Landslide XX shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-73 Landslide XXI shall be completely removed under continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-74 Landslide XXII shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-75 Landslide XXIII shall be completely removed during grading operations for TT 52455 under the continuous observations of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-76 Landslide XXIV shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-77 Landslide XXVII shall be completely removed during grading operations for Copper Hill Drive under continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-78 Landslide XXX shall be completely removed during grading operations for Copper Hill Drive under continuous observations of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-79 Landslide XXXI shall be completely removed during grading operations for Copper Hill Drive under continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist to ensure that all of the landslide material is removed. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-80 Landslide XXXIII shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-81	Landslide XXXIV shall be completely removed during grading operations for VTT 52455 under the continuous observation of the Project Engineering Geologist. In areas to receive fill, the removal bottoms shall be surveyed in order to document the removal for future reference and/or later additional grading.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-82	Any surficial failure material which remains below proposed grade shall be removed prior to the placement of certified fill.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-83	Removal depths shown on the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. Removals Map (Sheet 1 of 4 of Figure 4.1-1 of the DEIR) shall be adhered to.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-84	The large boulders (oversize material) in the terrace deposits shall be exported from the site or special handling (via Windrows) will be needed to mitigate the oversized material.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)							
4.1-85	A detailed analysis of debris flow hazard shall be undertaken at the Grading Plan stage for the site. Should mitigation prove necessary, the following measures are available to reduce the potential debris flow hazard: <ul style="list-style-type: none">remove loose surficial material,construct diverter slough walls,construct impact walls,construct debris basins,control run-off, and/orplant selective deep-rooted vegetation.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-86	Artificial fill deposits shall be completely removed and replaced and recompact, as necessary, prior to the placement of engineered fill.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-87	Dump fill deposits shall be completely removed and replaced and recompact , as necessary, prior to the placement of engineered fill.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-88	Sewage sludge shall be incorporated only in fills beneath roadways .	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section	3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-89	The existing provisions in the Grading Ordinance for planting and irrigation of constructed slopes in conjunction with drainage recommendations provided in the section "Surface Drainage Control," shall be implemented to prevent potential erosion within the subject site.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-90	Temporary construction cuts, such as stabilization keyway excavations, may be constructed at slopes steeper than 11/2:1. Actual geologic and ground water conditions identified for the grading plan stage of the project and also the expected duration of the open face shall govern the recommended slope stability of the cut slope.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-91	Whenever seepage is observed, the condition must be evaluated by the Engineering Geologist and Geotechnical Engineer prior to covering with fill material so that the necessary subdrain system is established. As a minimum, a subdrain shall be placed in all major swales or alluvial valleys below proposed major fills (see Figure 9 in the Allan E. Seward Engineering Geology, Inc. report).	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-92	Fill slopes shall be provided with subsurface drainage, as necessary, for stability. Geologically recommended canyon subdrain locations will be provided at the Grading Plan stage, when detailed 40-scale maps are available. The final location, spacing, and design of subdrains shall be determined by the Engineering Geologist or Geotechnical Engineer from field observations during grading operations. A subdrain shall be placed beneath all major fills in any alluvial valley or swale where a fill is planned.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer & Engineering Geologist)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-93 Backdrains shall be provided for Stability Fills and Buttresses.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-94 A synthetic geomembrane (such as high-density polyethylene-HDPE) with a coefficient of permeability of 10 ⁻⁶ cm/sec. or less shall be placed beneath the proposed tank sites. The barrier shall extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond the edge of the tank. A leakage collection and removal system (LCRS) shall be provided between the tank bottom and the geomembrane. Specific design recommendations for the membrane and the drainage system shall be provided at the Grading Plan stage.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-95 All finished pad surfaces shall be sloped to drain, with all depressions or ruts created during grading operations properly backfilled to eliminate ponding.	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading	To be addressed at a later date.Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
4.1-96 Drainage control design shall include provisions for positive surface gradients to ensure that surface runoff is not permitted to pond, particularly above slopes or adjacent to building foundations or slabs.	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading	To be addressed at a later date.Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
4.1-97 Surface runoff shall be directed away from slopes and foundations and collected in lined ditches or drainage swales, via non-erodible drainage devices, which shall discharge to paved roadways, or existing watercourses. If these facilities discharge onto natural ground, means shall be provided to control erosion and to create sheet flow.	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading	To be addressed at a later date.Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-98 Cut and fill slope terraces shall be provided with suitable drainage gradients and permanently lined ditches capable of collecting and transporting runoff water to suitable discharge points.	Applicant (Civil Engineer and Construction Superintendent)	Include this Measure in Specifications Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building and Safety 3. During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
4.1-99 Inlets of any pipes shall be designed against clogging and for minimum maintenance.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-100 Lateral discharge pipes shall be designed to accommodate some movement (slip joints) and underground conduits shall have cleanout facilities.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-101 Terraces shall be provided with suitable access in order to permit periodic cleaning and maintenance.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-102 Unless replaced by non-to-low-expansive soils to at least 4 feet below footing/slab bottoms, building foundations placed on expansive rock materials shall be constructed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footing Depth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Perimeter 24 inches; – Interior 18 inches; • Footing Reinforcement: one #4 top & bottom; • Floor Slab Thickness: 5 inches and provide footing/slab interface low friction joints at perimeter walls; • Floor Slab Reinforcement: #4 at 18 inches each way; • Provide Moisture Barrier: 2 inch sand and visqueen + 2 inch sand; and • Premoist (avoiding ponding) the subgrade 24 hours before pouring concrete. 	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-103 The standard setbacks from ascending and descending slopes provided in Section 1806.4 of the 1996 Los Angeles County Uniform Building Code shall be followed, unless superseded by specific geologic and/or soils engineering evaluations.	Applicant (Civil Engineer, Geotechnical Engineer, Engineering Geologist)	Building and Grading Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section and Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division and Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-104 The top of the ridge shall be cut to an elevation of 1382 feet or lower as shown in Figure 4.1-1.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-105 In order to minimize the potential for ground lurching and shattered ridge effects on the proposed elevated water tank pads, it is recommended that the proposed water tanks be setback a minimum of 15 feet from the top of the adjacent descending slopes.	Applicant (Engineering Geologist)	Setback Zones Identified on Tract Maps/Site Plans	1. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Geology Section, and Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.1-106 To mitigate seismically-induced settlements, existing earth materials shall be removed to 16 feet to 18 feet at the general location of CPT-6 and CPT-7, and then tapered to 4-foot removals to CPT-1 location. At the general location of CPT-8 and CPT-9A, existing earth materials shall be removed to 16 feet.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-107 To mitigate seismically-induced settlements, a cap of 29 feet shall be placed at HS-1 location.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-108 To mitigate seismically-induced settlements and based on currently proposed grades, the existing grade shall be raised about 17 feet at HS-1 location which, in conjunction with a 16-foot removal, will provide a cap of 33 feet at this location which is greater than the conservative required cap of 29 feet.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
4.1-109 To mitigate seismically-induced settlements, extra reinforcement in addition to structural requirements shall be provided for footings and slabs of buildings in the general locations of HS-1, CPT-7, CPT-6, CPT-8 and CPT-9A, and to the east of these locations.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits and Verify During Grading	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status	
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-110 Implement one or more of the following corrosion control measures, as appropriate, to increase the life of metal construction materials that would be subject to significant corrosion: a. Abrasive blast underground steel utilities and apply a high quality dielectric coating, such as extruded polyethylene, a tape coating system, hot applied coal tar enamel, or fusion bonded epoxy. b. Bond underground steel pipe with rubber gasketed, mechanical, grooved end, or other non-conductive type joints for electrical continuity. Electrical continuity is necessary for corrosion monitoring and cathodic protection. c. Electrically insulate each buried steel pipeline from dissimilar metals, cement-mortar coated and concrete encased steel, and above-ground steel pipe to prevent dissimilar metal corrosion cells and to facilitate the application of cathodic protection. d. Apply cathodic protection to steel piping as per NACE International RP-0169-92. e. As an alternative to dielectric coating and cathodic protection, apply a cement mortar coating or encase in cement-slurry or concrete 3 inches thick, using any type of cement.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.	
		Field Verification	2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division		
			3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits		

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-110 (cont.)				
f. Coat hydraulic elevator cylinders as described above. Electrically insulate each cylinder from building metals by installing dielectric material between the piston platen and car, insulating the bolts, and installing an insulated joint in the oil line. Apply cathodic protection to hydraulic cylinders as per NACE International RP-0169-92. As an alternative to electrical insulation and cathodic protection, place each cylinder in a plastic casing with a plastic watertight seal at the bottom.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.
		Field Verification	2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division	
			3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	
g. The elevator oil line should be placed above ground if possible but, if underground, should be protected as described above for steel utilities.				
h. Encase cast and ductile iron piping in 8 mil thick low-density polyethylene or 4 mil thick high-density, cross-laminated polyethylene plastic tubes or wraps per AWWA Standard C105 or coat using polyurethane, extruded polyethylene, or hot applied coal tar enamel. However, do not use the low density polyethylene wrap on flange joints or any other sharp-edged items. As an alternative, encase iron piping with cement slurry or concrete at least 3 inches thick surrounding the pipe, using any type of cement. Electrically insulate underground iron pipe from dissimilar metals and above ground iron pipe with insulated joints.				

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status	
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)					
4.1-110 (cont.)					
i. No special precautions are necessary for bare copper tubing for cold water. Hot water tubing installed underground would be subject to a higher corrosion rate. The best corrosion control measure would be to place the hot copper tubing above ground. If buried, encase in plastic pipe to prevent soil contact, or apply cathodic protection.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.	
		Field Verification	2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division		
				3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Mass grading in progress for Area C.
j. On any type of pipe, coat bare steel appurtenances, such as bolts, joint harnesses, or flexible couplings, with a coal tar or elastomer based mastic, coal tar epoxy, moldable sealant, wax tape, or equivalent after assembly.					
k. Where metallic pipelines penetrate concrete structures such as building floors or walls, use plastic sleeves, rubber seals, or other dielectric material to prevent pipe contact with the concrete and reinforcing steel.					
l. Any type of cement or standard concrete cover over reinforcing steel may be used for concrete structures and pipe in contact with these soils.					

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-110 (cont.)				
m	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
		Field Verification	2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division	
				3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits
n.				
<p>It is assumed that prestressed concrete piles will contain at least eight sacks of type 2 prestressed cement per cubic yard of concrete, a water/cement ratio not exceeding 0.45, and 1.5 inches of concrete cover. No further corrosion control measures are required for such piles. If ground water is present, solid steel lifting lugs are recommended to prevent ground water from wicking into the pile interior. If wire rope lifting lugs are used, they should be carefully drilled out 1.25 inches deep and the hole filled with epoxy or grout.</p> <p>Steel piles are most susceptible to corrosion in disturbed soil where oxygen is available. Further dissimilar environment corrosion cell would exist between the steel embedded in concrete, such as pile caps and the steel in the soil. In the cell, the steel in the soil is the anode (corroding electrode), and the steel in concrete is the cathode (protected electrode). This cell can be minimized by coating the part of the steel piles that will be embedded in concrete to prevent contact with concrete and reinforcing steel.</p>				

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.1 GEOTECHNICAL RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.1-110 (cont.)				
<p>o. Steel piles should be abrasive blasted and coated with coal tar epoxy 15 mils thick from the top to 10 feet below any disturbed soil or the water table is less than 30 feet below grade. Although this tough coating may be abraded or damaged somewhat during driving, it will provide a great deal of protection. After driving, cutoff, and welding any steel to be attached to the piles, coal all bare steel to be encased in concrete.</p> <p>p. As an alternative, bare steel piles may be used with a corrosion allowance that will depend on disturbed soil and water table depth.</p> <p>q. Steel pipe pile interiors may be protected by filling with concrete or hermetically sealing both ends.</p>	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases. Mass grading in progress for Area C.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.2 FLOOD/WATER QUALITY					
4.2-1	All on- and off-site flood and water quality control improvements, as shown on Figure 4.2-2, Drainage Concept Plan, and necessary to serve the project are to be designed and constructed in accordance with the policies and standards of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Flood Control Division.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Approval of Drainage Plans Field Verification	1. LACDPW, LACFCD 2. LACDPW, LACFCD 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	Master Hydrology Report for Area B, C &D of VTTM 52455 approved 9/25/2000. Hydrology Study for Parcel Map 25802 in Area C of VTTM 52455 approved 10/23/01.
4.2-2	The project applicant shall, as necessary, financially participate in the construction of that portion of PD2771 needed to adequately accommodate project generated runoff.	Applicant	Approval of Drainage Plans	1. LACDPW, LACFCD 2. LACDPW, LACFCD 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	Master Hydrology Report for Area B, C &D of VTTM 52455 approved 9/25/2000. Hydrology Study for Parcel Map 25802 in Area C of VTTM 52455 approved 10/23/01.
4.2-3	The applicant shall acquire permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) prior to the commencement of any work within the San Francisquito Creek.	Applicant	Receipt of Streambed Agreements	1. ACOE, CDFG, LACDPW, LACFCD 2. ACOE, CDFG, LACDPW, LACFCD 3. Prior to Grading	All construction activities will be consistent with the Natural Resources Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.2 FLOOD/WATER QUALITY (cont.)				
4.2-4 The applicant shall adhere to the following conditions relative to development within and adjacent to the southerly-flowing blueline stream: <ul style="list-style-type: none">If threatened or endangered species could be impacted by the work proposed, the project applicant shall obtain the required state and federal threatened and endangered species permits or have CDFG-approved measures in place to ensure no impacts occur, prior to proceeding with the project. If work has commenced and threatened or endangered species could be impacted, all work shall cease until the applicant obtains the required permits or has CDFG-approved measures in place to ensure no impacts occur.If mature perennial trees (including oak, elderberry, sycamore, and willow) will be removed from the stream's bed and/or banks, they shall be replaced in-kind at a 1:1 ratio at a CDFG-approved site, if installed two years in advance of the removal of habitat from the construction site. If replacement cannot be installed two years in advance, the replacement ratio shall be 3:1. The replacement habitat shall be maintained until established, under the direction of a CDFG representative.An inventory of native trees, including but not limited to, willows, cottonwoods, walnuts, oaks, elderberry, and sycamores, by species and diameter breast height (dbh), with dbhs in excess of 4 inches, which must be removed shall be submitted to the Department prior to construction. No vehicles shall be driven in, and no work shall be conducted in ponded or flowing areas.	Applicant	Confirmation that 1600 Permit not required	1. CDFG 2. LACDPW, FCD 3. Prior to Grading Permit	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.2 FLOOD/WATER QUALITY (cont.)				
4.2-4 (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Staging/storage areas for equipment and materials shall be located outside of the stream.No equipment maintenance shall be done within or near any stream channel or lake margin where petroleum products or other pollutants from the equipment may enter these areas under any flow.No debris, soil, silt, sand, bark, slash, sawdust, rubbish, cement or concrete or washings thereof, oil or petroleum products or other organic or earthen material from any construction, or associated activity of whatever nature shall be allowed to enter into or placed where it may be washed by rainfall or runoff into, waters of the State. When operations are completed, any excess materials or debris shall be removed from the work area. No rubbish leaks shall be deposited within 150 feet of the high water mark of any stream or lake. <p>If it is found that impacts may occur to species of special concern, threatened, and/or endangered species, the applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement under Fish and Game Code 1600 et seq., or meet other requirements as deemed necessary by the CDFG.</p>	Applicant	Confirmation that 1600 Permit not required	1. CDFG 2. LACDPW, FCD 3. Prior to Grading Permit	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.2-5 If the construction of the proposed desilting inlets, and/or water quality filters along the site boundaries requires grading on adjacent properties, agreements from the affected adjacent property owner(s) shall be obtained prior to the recording of the final map.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Receipt of all Necessary Agreements	1. ACOE, CDFG, LACDPW, LACFCD 2. ACOE, CDFG, LACDPW, LACFCD 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	To be determined at a later date.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.2 FLOOD/WATER QUALITY (cont.)				
4.2-6 Prior to the approval and recordation of final maps, a Final Drainage Plan and Final Grading Plan (including an Erosion Control Plan if required) must be prepared by the applicant to ensure that no significant erosion, sedimentation, or flooding impacts would occur during or after development of the project site and proposed off-site drainage facilities. These plans shall be prepared to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works. Temporary erosion control measures may include minimizing existing vegetation removal; using temporary soil covers, such as hydroseeding, to protect exposed soil from wind and rain; and installing silt fencing, berms (i.e., sandbagging), and dikes to protect storm drain inlets and drainage courses. Permanent erosion control measures may include drainage swales, slope drains, storm drain inlet/outlet protection, and sediment traps.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Approval of Final Hydrology Plan, Final Drainage Plan, and Final Grading Plan	1. LACDPW, FCD and Geology / Soils Section 2. LACDPW, FCD and Geology / Soils Section 3. Prior to Recording of Each Subdivision Map	Master Hydrology Report for Area B, C &D of VTTM 52455 approved 9/25/2000. Bulk Grading Interim Hydrology Study approved 8/28/2002. Mass Grading in progress for Area C.
4.2-7 The applicant for any subdivision map permitting construction shall satisfy all applicable requirements of the NPDES Program in effect in Los Angeles County to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (LACDPW). These requirements currently include preparation of an Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (USWMP) containing design features and Best Management Practices (BMPs) appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. In addition, the requirements currently include preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the subdivision. The SWPPP shall, at minimum, address material storage and handling procedures; equipment operation, storage, maintenance, and repair procedures; construction site cleanliness; and erosion control measures. The LACDPW shall monitor compliance with those NPDES requirements.	Applicant (Construction Superintendent)	Submittal of a USWMP and SWPPP to RWQCBLAR Field Verification	1. RWQCBLAR 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety RWQCBLAR 3. Prior to Grading and During Grading Operations	See Appendix A for a copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for VTTM 52455.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA					
4.3-1	The applicant shall have a vegetation planting and maintenance plan acceptable to the County and appropriate resource agencies be developed by a qualified habitat restoration specialist to address the above revegetation measures. The plan will specify, at a minimum, the following: (1) the location of the planting site; (2) the quantity and species of plants to be planted; (3) planting procedures, including the use of irrigation; (4) the amount and location of exotic species removal from riparian habitat areas, if appropriate; (5) a schedule and action plan to maintain and monitor the plantings for a minimum 5 year period; and (6) a list of criteria (e.g., growth, plant cover, survivorship) by which to measure success of the plantings, as well as contingency measures if the plantings are not successful. Guidelines for preserving remaining riparian habitat shall also be included in the planting and maintenance plan. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the County Department of Regional Planning biologist, ACOE, and CDFG prior to issuance of project grading permits.	Applicant (Project Biologist)		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE, CDFG 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan	The River Trail and upland preserve zone landscaping and revegetation plans will be submitted to the County by ----- prior to the issuance of Grading Permit(s) within the upland preserve zone or for the River Trail. Landscape and revegetation plans shall be reviewed consistent with the Natural Resource Management Plan approved permits.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3	BIOTA (cont.)			
4.3-2	The permanent loss of cottonwood-willow riparian woodland, alluvial scrub, and riparian scrub vegetation as a result of development activities shall be mitigated through replacement of this habitat with habitat of similar functions and values to that being removed. The habitat shall be replaced by the applicant at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio installed two years in advance of the removal of habitat at the construction site. If replacement habitat cannot be installed two years in advance of the project, the replacement ratio shall be 3:1 for these communities. Replacement of this habitat shall be located in the creekbed, or at suitable locations outside the creekbed where there are appropriate hydrologic conditions to create a self-sustaining riparian habitat. Replacement shall not occur in areas already designated for mitigation for impacts as a result of other project activities along the river. First priority for revegetation location shall be given to other riparian areas located within the project site boundaries. After the completion of Decoro Bridge, current "Arizona" crossings shall be removed and revegetated. If no suitable locations can be found, then revegetation shall occur in suitable locations immediately adjacent to the site, or in the immediate vicinity, within the San Francisquito Creek or Santa Clara River drainage and as approved by Los Angeles County and appropriate resource agencies and jurisdictions (CDFG, USFWS, and/or Army Corps). Native plant species similar to those being removed will serve as a basis for the vegetation replacement. Revegetation will occur in areas already containing similar vegetation and in such a way as to create large, contiguous blocks of habitat.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	<div>1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE, CDFG.</div> <div>2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE, CDFG</div> <div>3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plans and Monitor During Restoration Effort</div>	<div>The River Trail and upland preserve zone landscaping and revegetation plans will be submitted to the County <u>prior to the issuance of Grading Permit(s) within the upland preserve zone or for the River Trail by _____.</u></div> <div>Landscape and revegetation plans shall be reviewed consistent with the Natural Resource Management Plan approved permits.</div>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3	BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-3	If enough locations cannot be found to fully mitigate lost riparian habitat at the ratios described above, then the removal of exotics (i.e., non-native, invasive plant or animal species) such as <i>Arundo donax</i> may be conducted by the applicant in lieu of the remaining revegetation that could not be completed, as determined by the County Department of Regional Planning, CDFG, and ACOE. Because the infestation of these species can dramatically decrease the biological values and functions of riparian habitats comprised of native plant species, the intent of this alternative is to enhance/increase the functions and values of already established riparian habitat that have been infested by exotic plant species. There are five major stands of <i>Arundo</i> within the project area, clustered within the riparian scrub habitats in the central portion of the reach, and within the margin of the alluvial scrub below Decoro Drive, wherein removal efforts may be concentrated. Clearing the species from these areas and revegetating them with cuttings from site stock would provide a rapid increase in natural scrub habitat values. The amount of exotic plants to be removed shall be determined by a qualified restoration biologist and approved by the County Department of Regional Planning biologist and appropriate resource agencies and jurisdictions (CDFG and/or Army Corps) with the overall goal being to increase riparian values and functions of established areas to the same level as that being removed as a result of project implementation. The removal program shall utilize methods and procedures approved by Fish and Game and Army Corps to remove exotics, including but not limited to, mechanical equipment in specific areas, hand cutting, and the application of herbicides to stumps. Removal areas shall be kept free of exotic plant species for five years after initial treatment. Plant removal methodologies, locations, and monitoring shall be included as part of the revegetation plan.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Comments and Documentation of Restoration Monitoring from Qualified Biologist Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE, CDFG. 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE, CDFG 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plans and Monitor During Restoration Effort	As mitigation, the project applicant has cleared all of the <i>Arundo</i> along San Francisquito Creek to the confluence of the Santa Clara River (December 2000).

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)					
4.3-4	No earlier than 45 days and no later than 20 days prior to the removal of any wildlife habitat during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (February 1 through August 1), the applicant shall have a field survey be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if active nests of special-status birds (including raptors) are present in the construction zone or within 300 feet of the construction zone. If construction is proposed during the breeding and nesting season, such surveys will be conducted at bi-weekly intervals during the months of April, May, and June. In the event that an active nest is spotted in the habitats to be disturbed, or in other habitats within 300 feet of construction boundaries, clearing and construction within 300 feet shall be postponed until the nest is vacated and juveniles have fledged (which typically takes 3-4 weeks for most small birds), as determined by the biologist, and there is no evidence of a second attempt at nesting. The field survey shall be conducted to the satisfaction of the County and monthly reports submitted by the biological monitor to the County during grading operations.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Survey Results	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, County 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	The project biologist has conducted on- going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B).

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3	BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-5	To avoid disturbance such as siltation and sedimentation into special-status fish and arroyo toad breeding areas and the potential loss of special-status fish species, including arroyo chub and Santa Ana sucker, the construction and maintenance of the bridge, water quality filters, entrapment and filtration features, as well as direct inflow structures shall not occur during water flows determined by a qualified biologist with experience with these fish and the toad to be adequate for these species to occur within the project site or immediately downstream from the project site (typically immediately after periods of heavy or consistent rain). These activities shall not alter or damage habitat values for these species, nor place materials or structures in the habitat which have the potential to adversely affect these species.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Grading	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). See Appendix A for copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans prepared for VTTM 52455. All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-6 Alternatively, if construction activities must occur during time periods when special-status fish species, other than UTS, are likely to be in the river systems, prior to initiating these activities, all construction sites and access roads within the creekbed, as well as all creekbed areas within 300 feet of the construction site and access roads, shall be inspected by a qualified biologist for the presence of the species listed above. If present, all construction sites and any temporary access roads within the creekbed shall be cleared of the species listed above immediately before the prescribed work is to be carried out, immediately before any equipment is moved into or through the stream or habitat areas, and immediately before diverting any stream water. State and federal agencies will be notified prior to any construction activities.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Survey Results	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, County 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.
4.3-7 The removal of such species shall be conducted by a qualified biologist using procedures approved by the USFWS and CDFG, and with the appropriate endangered species permits. A plan to temporarily relocate these species shall be developed before the action in coordination with the USFWS and CDFG. The County shall be notified of any temporary relocation effort prior to construction and submit a follow-up report after the operation is completed.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of relocation plan	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, USFWS, CDFG 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, USFWS, CDFG 3. Prior to Grading	All construction activities will be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-8 The loss of 7.41 acres of riparian habitat that is expected to serve as migration foraging and resting habitat for least Bell’s vireo will be mitigated through the replacement of this habitat as specified in Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-4 . If habitat removal is conducted during the vireo breeding season, surveys shall be conducted prior to removal to ensure no nesting vireos are present.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	None needed	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, USFWS, CDFG 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, USFWS, CDFG 3. Prior to Grading	The river trail and upland preserve zone landscaping and revegetation plan will be submitted to the County <u>prior to the issuance of Grading Permit(s) within the upland preserve zone or for the River Trail on ____.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)					
4.3-9	For all grading and construction activities within 300 feet of riparian resources, a County-approved biologist shall be retained at the expense of the applicant as a construction environmental monitor to ensure that incidental construction impacts on biological resources are avoided or minimized, and to conduct pre-grading field surveys for special-status plant and wildlife species that may be destroyed as a result of construction and/or site preparation activities. The biological monitor will be given authorization to stop specific construction activities if violations of mitigation measures or any local, state, or federal laws are suspected. Responsibilities of the construction environmental monitor include the following:	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Revegetation Plan Review Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and during Grading	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attend all pre-grade meetings to ensure that timing/location of construction activities do not conflict with mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for plants and wildlife). Review/designate the construction area in the field with the Contractor and the County inspector in accordance with the final approved grading plan. Haul roads and access roads should be sited within grading areas to minimize degradation of habitat adjacent to these areas. If activities outside these limits are necessary, they should be evaluated by the biologist to ensure no special-status species or habitat will be affected. Supervise cordoning of preserved natural areas that lie outside grading areas identified in CEQA documentation (e.g., with temporary fence posts and colored rope). 				

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-9 (cont.)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduct a field review of the staking (to be set by the surveyor) designating the limits of all construction activity. Any construction activity areas immediately adjacent to riparian areas or other special-status resources (such as oak trees, rare plants, or bird nests) may be flagged or temporarily fenced by the monitor, at his/her discretion. Conduct meetings with the Contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas. The monitor should also discuss procedures for minimizing harm/harassment of wildlife encountered during construction. <p>Periodically visit the site during construction to coordinate and monitor compliance with the above provisions.</p>	Applicant (Project Biologist)	<p>Revegetation Plan Review</p> <p>Field Verification</p>	<p>1. LA County Department of Regional Planning</p> <p>2. LA County Department of Regional Planning</p> <p>3. Prior to and during Grading</p>	<p>The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B).</p> <p>All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.</p>
4.3-10 Construction personnel shall be prohibited from entry into areas outside the designated construction area, except for necessary construction related activities, such as surveying. All such construction activities shall be coordinated with the construction environmental monitor.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)		<p>1. LA County Department of Regional Planning</p> <p>2. LA County Department of Regional Planning</p> <p>3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity</p>	Pre-grading conferences were conducted in August 2002.
4.3-11 Equipment shall not be operated in areas of ponded or flowing water without approval of the Army Corps, Fish and Game, and/or USFWS. Requests for work in these areas must contain a biological evaluation demonstrating that no sensitive fish, amphibians, reptiles and/or birds are currently present, or likely to be present during construction, at the construction site, or along access roads. No construction activities within riparian resources shall be allowed without prior approval by the biological monitor in accordance with approved grading plans.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)		<p>1. LA County Department of Regional Planning</p> <p>2. LA County Department of Regional Planning</p> <p>3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity</p>	Pre-grading conferences were conducted in August 2002.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-12 Temporary sediment retention ponds shall be constructed downstream of construction sites that are located in the creekbed when the following circumstances apply: (1) the construction site contains flowing or ponded water that drains off-site into the undisturbed streamflow or ponds; or (2) streamflow is diverted around the construction site, but the work is occurring in the period November 1st through April 15th, when storm flows could inundate the construction site. The sediment ponds shall be constructed of creekbed material. The ponds shall be maintained and repaired after flooding events, and shall be restored to pre-construction grades and substrate conditions within 30 days after construction has ended. Any disturbance to riparian vegetation resulting from construction of sediment ponds shall be documented by the biologist and a report submitted to the County, CDFG, and ACOE and any adverse effects will be mitigated as detailed in Mitigation Measures 4.31 through 4.3-3 .	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.
4.3-13 If a stream channel has been altered during construction, the low flow channel shall be returned as nearly as practical to pre-project topographic conditions without creating a possible future bank erosion problem. The gradient of the streambed shall be returned to pre-project grade, to the extent practical, unless such operation is part of a restoration project, in which case, the change in grade must be approved by the Army Corps prior to project commencement unless it is specified as a restoration area. All disturbances to riparian resources from temporary stream channel alteration shall be documented by the biological monitor and reported to the County and ACOE and any adverse effects mitigated as detailed in Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-3 .	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE 3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-14 Staging/storage areas for construction equipment and materials shall be located outside of the creek and associated riparian habitat areas.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). Mass grading ongoing within Area C.
4.3-15 Construction activities shall be limited to the following areas of disturbance: (1) 60 feet on either side of the outer edge of the proposed Decoro Bridge; and (2) 50-foot-wide corridor for all utility lines within or proximate to San Francisquito Creek. The locations of these temporary construction sites and the routes of all access roads shall be shown on construction maps. Any variation from these limits shall be noted, with a justification for a variation. The construction plans shall indicate what type of vegetation, if any, would be disturbed. Revegetation activities shall be in compliance with Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-3 .	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B). All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status			
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)									
4.3-16 Any equipment or vehicles driven and/or operated within or adjacent to the creek channel shall be checked and maintained daily, to prevent leaks of materials that if introduced to water could be deleterious to aquatic life. No equipment maintenance shall be conducted within the creek channel or within 50 feet of this channel. Maintenance of stationary equipment shall be allowed at the construction site within the creek channel provided that drip pans are utilized and measures are taken to ensure that no petroleum products spill from the drip pans. Stationary equipment such as motors, pumps, generators, and welders, located within the creekbed construction zone shall be positioned over drip pans. Any accidental spills of petroleum products shall be immediately reported to CDFG, ACOE, USFWS, and other appropriate agencies. Any necessary clean-up measures will be promptly initiated.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning	2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning	3.	Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	See Appendix A for a copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for VTTM 52455.
4.3-17 To reduce the impact of runoff into San Francisquito Creek during construction, Best Management Practices shall be implemented during construction activities to control erosion and sedimentation. When construction timing permits, grading should be conducted during the dry season months to minimize the potential of adverse impacts to downstream habitats. Grading during the rainy season months shall utilize erosion/siltation control devices which may include, but are not limited to, hay bales, sedimentation rolls, diversion barriers, and sandbags. To reduce the impacts of runoff during project operation, measures included as conditions of the NPDES permit shall be implemented.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning	2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning	3.	Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	See Appendix A for a copy of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan for VTTM 52455.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3	BIOTA (cont.)						
4.3-18	Standard dust control measures shall be implemented to reduce impacts on nearby plants and wildlife. This includes watering active grading sites at least twice daily; suspending all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds exceed 25 mph; and restricting traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less in areas within 200 feet of vegetation.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE		Dust Control Plan for VTTM 52455 found in Appendix C.
				2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, ACOE		
				3.	Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity		
4.3-19	Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall restore all haul roads and access roads that are outside of approved grading limits. This restoration shall be done in consultation with the biologist construction monitor and reviewed and approved by the County.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Revegetation Plan Review	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
			Field Verification	2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		
				3.	Prior to and after Grading and Construction activity		

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)					
4.3-20	<p>To minimize direct and indirect disturbance to "waters of the U.S.," an Army Corps Section 404 permit, pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act, will be necessary for fill of jurisdictional habitat. This includes fill and other impacts associated with Decoro Bridge, water treatment and filter facilities, and the proposed trail. In addition, a streambed alteration agreement shall be executed with Fish and Game pursuant to Section 1603 of the California Fish and Game Code for construction and maintenance activities that will disturb or alter the streambed or associated riparian vegetation. Mitigation measures identified by the agencies through these two permitting processes are expected to include all or portions of Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-24.</p> <p>These measures will include the creation of an oxbow pond similar to that being filled for the placement of abutments for Decoro Bridge. Creation of another ox-bow pond is possible within existing marginal portions of the channel, either above or below the Decoro Bridge crossing. Appropriate soils and hydrology studies shall be conducted to maximize the success of pond creation. The existing pond would be the model for the mitigation pond to be constructed in the creek. Creation of a similarly-aligned ox-bow channel, terminating at the margin of the main creek alluvium, should approximate the conditions under which the existing pond has persisted. Riparian and wetland vegetation occurring at the existing pond shall be planted around the created pond.</p>	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	<p>The project biologist has conducted on-going surveys of the project area (See Appendix B).</p> <p>All construction activities will also be conducted consistent with Natural Resource Management Plan Permits CDFG 5-502-97 and ACOE 404 2000 00998 AOA.</p>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status	
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)					
4.3-21	Access to San Francisquito Creek, as well as within the preserved setback area, shall be prohibited with fencing, signage, planted materials, or other means for pedestrians, domestic pets, and all recreational vehicles including bicycles, motorcycles, and off-road vehicles. Specific actions to restrict access shall include, among other things, posting signs identifying an ecological sensitive area, promoting public education and awareness of such ecological sensitivities, coordinating with Los Angeles County on the placement of trails and public access routes to and along the creek to avoid conflicts with sensitive biological resources, and the maintenance of fences and barricades to prevent unauthorized or unrestricted access to the creekbed.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Final Plans	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.3-22	Exotic and non-native plant species planted as part of landscaping could potentially invade adjacent natural open space areas and displace native species. As such, the project applicant shall prepare landscape design guidelines that describe adverse ecological effects associated with non-native, invasive plants. These guidelines shall be used during the review and approval process by the County for all landscaping plans. Disposal of cuttings of any ornamental plants in on-site or off-site open space areas shall be strictly prohibited.	Applicant	Review of Landscape Design Guidelines	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Landscape Plans	The river trail and upland preserve zone landscaping and revegetation plan will be submitted to the County prior to the construction of residential units.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-23 Removal of non-native species such as giant cane (<i>Arundo donax</i>), salt cedar, tamarisk (<i>Tamarix</i> sp.), tree tobacco (<i>Nicotiana glauca</i>), and castor bean (<i>Ricinus communis</i>) from preserved upland and riparian areas shall be included in a revegetation plan to be reviewed and approved by the County to mitigate impacts, and shall be subject to the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First priority shall be given to those habitat patches that support or have a high potential for supporting special-status species. • All non-native species removals shall be conducted according to a resource agency approved exotics removal program. Removal of non-native species in patches of native habitat shall be conducted in such a way as to minimize impacts to the existing native riparian plant species.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and during Grading and Construction activity	As mitigation, the project applicant has cleared all of the Arundo along San Francisquito Creek to the confluence of the Santa Clara River (December 2000).
4.3-24 Upon completion of construction, the applicant shall be held responsible to restore any haul roads and access roads that are outside of approved grading limits. This restoration shall be done in consultation with the biologist construction monitor.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Revegetation Plan	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plans and Monitor During Restoration Effort	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Following grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.3-25 Non-native plants that are potentially invasive via airborne seeds, or that are particularly difficult to control once escaped, should be prohibited from all parts of the project. A list of the plants to be prohibited shall be prepared and reviewed by the County.	Applicant (Project Biologist)	Review of Revegetation Plan and Landscape Design Guidelines	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Revegetation Plan and Landscape Design Guidelines Monitor During Restoration Effort	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-26 Where night lighting occurs on the project site, the following measures shall apply: Night lighting shall be directed onto the property and shall be downcast luminaries with light patterns directed away from natural areas, as coordinated with the lighting engineer and the project biologist. Exterior lighting shall not exceed a maximum of 0.5 horizontal foot candles at a distance of 25 feet beyond the property boundary. No exterior lighting shall exceed 30 feet in height and direct light and glare shall not be observable at an angle greater than 85 degrees from the nadir of the vertical axis of the light source.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Final Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Final Plans	To be addressed at a later date. During and following site construction activities.
4.3-27 Whenever practical, repairs to Decoro Bridge shall be made from the bridge deck. If this is not practical, minimum encroachment upstream and/or downstream of the bridge will occur. The maintenance work area for structural repairs shall be limited to 30 feet on either side of the bridge and under the bridge itself. Equipment shall be introduced into the creekbed by means of an earth ramp constructed on the sideslope in the immediate vicinity, or from an adjacent invert access ramp if within 1,000 feet of the bridge. If the equipment must access the creekbed, care will be taken to minimize impacts to vegetation and to avoid destruction of large trees, defined as trees with trunks in excess of 4 inches in diameter breast height (dbh), measured at 4.5 feet above grade. Any loss of riparian vegetation shall be replaced as per Mitigation Measures 4.3-1 through 4.3-3.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activity	Decoro Bridge has been constructed.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)						
4.3-27 (cont.)	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning	Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activity	Decoro Bridge has been constructed.
Vehicles and equipment shall be routed to avoid, to the extent feasible, riparian vegetation, live streams, and wetted areas. The boundaries of the maintenance site and any temporary access roads within the creekbed shall be surveyed and marked in the field with stakes and flagging. No maintenance activities, vehicular access, equipment storage, stockpiling, or human intrusion shall occur outside the work area and access roads. If flowing or ponded water is located within the maintenance site (including stream diversions and sediment retention ponds) and access roads, the procedures described above in Mitigation Measure 4.3-8 to identify and relocate special-status fish species from live streams or ponded water shall be followed. If maintenance work in these areas would occur during the riparian bird breeding and nesting season (February 1 through August 1), then appropriate bird nest surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist and as described under Mitigation Measure 4.3-5 . A biological monitor shall be on the site during all maintenance activities that would occur within or adjacent to the creek and riparian resources. Reports shall be submitted to the Department of Regional Planning prior to and after each maintenance activity occurrence.		2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning			
			3.			

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-28 At least one month prior to initiation of grading activities, pre-construction trapping will be conducted to minimize the potential direct and indirect loss of special-status reptile species and fossorial mammation species of limited mobility. Methods of trapping can include use of drift fences, pitfall traps, and other similar trapping techniques as deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist. The trapping shall occur at a time of year deemed appropriate by a qualified biologist. All captured specimens shall be released into appropriate habitat adjacent to, but outside of, areas to be graded. Captured specimens of non-native fauna shall not be released back into the wild. All capture records shall be submitted to the Department of Fish and Game.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activity	Trapping to be conducted one month prior to initiation of grading activities on the site.
4.3-29 Prior to further grading or other site preparation activities, the applicant shall retain the services of a qualified biologist to prepare a plan for the creation of a habitat area on the southeast portion of the project site outside of the project's development footprint. The actual habitat area site design and location shall be approved by the County and CDFG and consist of a shallow excavated rainpool(s) utilizing a suitable pond liner as a base. The habitat area location shall be as far away as possible from any of the existing or future development areas, including roads and trails, and the location shall be at least the size of the largest occupied area observed on the site. The rainpool(s) shall be designed such that it only supports standing water for several weeks following seasonal rains such that aquatic predators (i.e., fish, bullfrog, crayfish, etc.) cannot become established.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to and During Grading and Construction Activity	Plan to be completed prior to initiation of grading activities on the designated habitat site.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.3 BIOTA (cont.)				
4.3-30 The qualified biologist shall monitor said habitat area for a period of five years, or as otherwise directed by the County and CDFG. Specific monitoring requirements and success criteria shall be approved by the County and CDFG. It is expected that minimum requirements will include annual monitoring during and immediately following peak breeding season such that surveys can be conducted for calling adults as well as for egg masses, larval and post larval toads. Further, survey data will be provided to the regulatory agencies by the monitoring biologist following each monitoring period and a written report summarizing the monitoring results will be provided to the regulatory agencies at the end of the monitoring effort. Success criteria for the monitoring program shall include verifiable evidence of toad reproduction at said habitat area.	Applicant (Construction Site Manager)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Following Grading and Construction Activity	Habitat area to be monitored for five years, or as otherwise directed by the County and CDFG, following grading and construction.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.4 VISUAL QUALITIES					
4.4-1	Where residential or commercial structures are sited along highways, building heights and rooflines shall be varied and trees and other landscaping shall be planted to soften the silhouette of buildings and to blend them into the natural terrain.	Applicant (Project Landscape Architect)	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	To be addressed at a later date. During and following site construction activities.
4.4-2	The project shall comply with the Los Angeles County Hillside Design Guidelines.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Grading Permits	Los Angeles County approved a bulk grading plan (Permit No. 0820 0204160002) for VTTM 52455 on September 4, 2002.
4.4-3	Graded slopes shall be landscaped, irrigated and permanently maintained.	Applicant (Project Landscape Architect)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Grading Permits	See the SWPPP contained in Appendix A.
4.4-4	Large graded slopes located along highways or visible from Interstate 5 shall be contoured by varying the slope increments.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Grading Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Approval of Grading Permits	Los Angeles County approved a bulk grading plan (Permit No. 0820 0204160002) for VTTM 52455 on September 4, 2002.
4.4-5	Fencing or walls, where used, shall be designed to be compatible with the adjoining architectural theme, and shall be of a consistent design within the neighborhood or commercial site.	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	Building Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Landscape Plan for VTTM 52455 to be submitted to the County by <u> </u> prior to the issuance of building permits.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.5 TRAFFIC/ACCESS					
4.5-1	The project applicant would construct all on-site local roadways and intersections to LACDPW standards.	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Traffic & Lighting Division 2. LACDPW, Traffic & Lighting Division 3. Prior to Approval of Final Plans	<u>During and following site construction activities. To be addressed at a later date.</u>
4.5-2	The project would contribute its fair share towards the construction of the following roadway links: 1. Copper Hill Drive between McBean Parkway and Rye Canyon. 2. Newhall Ranch Road between Rye Canyon Road/Copper Hill Drive and Avenue Tibbitts/Dickason Drive, and Avenue Scott between Avenue Tibbitts and McBean Parkway.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>To be addressed at a later date. Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>
4.5-3	Based on the Ambient Growth Scenario impact analysis, the improvements shown in Table 4.5-8, Mitigation Measures - Existing Plus Ambient Growth Plus Project Conditions shall be in place prior to occupancy of the project, except that one or more of these mitigation measures may be modified or eliminated if: (1) the improvement has been constructed by others; or (2) an Ambient Growth Scenario traffic report approved by the LACDPW prior to recordation provides a modified list of improvements to be constructed for the project, or for an individual phase of the project.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits.</u>
4.5-4	Based on the Interim Year Scenario, the project shall fund its fair share of the improvements (Tables 4.5-10, Interim Year Roadway Improvements and 4.5-12, Project Traffic Shares), or construct improvements to the highway network of equal value.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to Issuance of Building Permits. To be addressed at a later date.</u>

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.5	TRAFFIC/ACCESS (cont.)				
4.5-5	If a Bridge and Thoroughfare District is formed which includes the project area, the project developer shall pay the applicable Bridge and Thoroughfare fee, or shall provide highway and/or intersection/interchange improvements of an equal value in lieu of the Bridge and Thoroughfare fee.	Applicant	Field Verification of Construction or Receipt of Fair Share Funding	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.5-6	To facilitate transit service to the site, the project applicant shall coordinate with the local transit agency provide to identify appropriate on-site bus stop/turnout locations.	Applicant	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Traffic & Lighting Division 2. LACDPW, Traffic & Lighting Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.5-7	For gated entrances, methodology to calculate queuing storage shall be calculated in conformance with the Queuing Analysis presented in Table 4.5-6, Queuing Analysis.	Applicant (Traffic Engineer)	Building Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Traffic & Lighting Division 2. LACDPW, Traffic & Lighting Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.6 NOISE					
4.6-1	All construction activity occurring on the project site shall adhere to the requirements of the “County of Los Angeles Construction Equipment Noise Standards,” County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.440 as identified in Table 4.6-3.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)		1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	All grading and construction activity must adhere to provisions and requirements of County Noise Ordinance. Mass grading underway for Area C.
4.6-2	Limit all construction activities near occupied on- and off-site residences to between the hours of 6:30 A.M. and 8:00 P.M., and exclude all Sundays and legal holidays pursuant to County Department of Public Works, Construction Division standards.	Applicant (Construction Contractor)		1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits and Verify During Project Construction	All grading and construction activity must adhere to provisions and requirements of County Noise Ordinance. Mass grading underway for Area C.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
RWQCBLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.6 NOISE (cont.)				
4.6-3	Prior to the issuance of building permits, an acoustical study shall be conducted for residential uses planned along the following roadway segments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">550-foot segment of Copper Hill Drive located due south of the MWD Fee Property.800-foot segment of “OO” Street located due south of the MWD Fee Property. <p>The acoustical study shall review the site specific uses proposed on these lots and provide design guidance so that interior noise levels resulting from outside sources will not exceed adopted County standards for the specified use. Design/mitigation features may include orientation and placement of buildings and windows, elevation changes, berms, the use of double-paned windows, sound walls, and noise insulation. Noise measurements shall be conducted prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy to ensure that the noise levels with proposed mitigation features are within adopted County standards.</p>	Applicant (Civil Engineer)	1. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 2. LACDPW, Building & Safety Division 3. Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Occupancy	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.6 NOISE (cont.)					
4.6-4	All residential air conditioning equipment installed within the project site shall adhere to the requirements of the “County of Los Angeles Residential Air Conditioning and Refrigeration Noise Standards,” County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.530. Specifically, equipment installed shall not exceed the any of the following noise levels: 55 dB(A) at any point on neighboring property line, 5 feet above grade level, no closer than 3 feet from any wall; 50 dB(A) at center of neighboring patio, 5 feet above grade level, no closer than 3 feet from any wall; 50 dB(A) outside the neighboring living area window nearest the equipment location, not more than 3 feet from the window opening, but at least 3 feet from any other surface.	Building Contractor	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to the Issuance of Occupancy Permits	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during site construction activities.</u>
4.6-5	All stationary and point sources of noise occurring on the project site shall adhere to the requirements of the County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.390 as identified in Table 4.6-2, County of Los Angeles Exterior Noise Standards for Stationary and Point Noise Sources.	Future Owners/ Operators within project	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LA County Department of Building and Safety 3. During Life of Project	<u>During Life of Project.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.6-6	For the commercial centers, and elementary school, loading, unloading, opening, closing, or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans or similar objects between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M. shall occur in a way that prevents a noise disturbance from impacting residences (County of Los Angeles Ordinance No. 11743, §12.08.460).	Future Owners/ Operators within project	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Health Services 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to the Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Life of Project	<u>During Life of Project.</u> To be addressed at a later date.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY					
4.7-1	Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.
4.7-2	Provide temporary traffic controls to maintain traffic flow when construction activities have the potential to disrupt traffic (e.g., signage, flag person, detours).	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	Ongoing during grading and site preparation.
4.7-3	Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow to off-peak hours to the degree practicable.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Ongoing during site construction.</u>
4.7-4	Develop a construction traffic management plan for use when construction traffic has the potential to affect traffic on public streets. The plan should include provisions for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rerouting construction traffic off congested streets to the degree practicable; Consolidating truck deliveries when possible; and Providing temporary dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on and off of the site. 	Applicant	Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	<u>Ongoing during site construction.</u> To be addressed at a later date.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY (cont.)					
4.7-5	Maintain equipment and vehicle engines in good condition and in proper tune as per manufacturers’ specifications and per SCAQMD rules, to minimize exhaust emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.
4.7-6	Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second stage smog alerts.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.
4.7-7	Use electricity from power poles when present, practicable, and cost effective rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.
4.7-8	Use methanol- or natural gas-powered mobile equipment and pile drivers instead of diesel if readily available at competitive prices.	Applicant	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY (cont.)					
4.7-9	Use propane- or butane-powered on-site mobile equipment instead of gasoline if readily available at competitive prices.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.
4.7-10	The project shall comply with and implement the applicable provisions of the most recently adopted SCAQMD Rule 403 and <u>Rule 403 Implementation Handbook</u> .	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	See the Dust Control Plan (Appendix C) and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (Appendix A) for VTTM 52455.
4.7-11	The project shall comply with and implement the applicable provisions of the most recently adopted SCAQMD Rule 1113.	Applicant		1. SCAQMD, LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. SCAQMD, LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading and Construction	<u>During Grading and Construction.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.7-12	Utilize low emission water heaters in residential uses if readily available, practicable, and cost effective, to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.	Applicant	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
4.7-13	Residential uses are to utilize built-in energy-efficient appliances to reduce energy consumption and emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY (cont.)				
4.7-14 Provide shade trees in residential subdivisions to reduce building heating/cooling needs.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-15 Residential uses are to utilize energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners to reduce energy consumption and emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-16 Install special sunlight-filtering window coatings or double-paned windows in residential uses to reduce thermal gain or loss.	Applicant	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-17 Utilize automatic lighting on/off controls and energy-efficient lighting in new residential construction (including parking areas) to reduce electricity consumption and associated emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-18 If possible, use light-colored roofing materials in new residential construction as opposed to dark roofing materials. These materials would reflect, rather than absorb, sunlight and minimize heat gains in buildings. This measure would lessen the overall demand for mechanical air conditioning systems.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY (cont.)					
4.7-19	Utilize low emission water heaters in commercial uses if readily available, practicable, and cost effective to reduce natural gas consumption and emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-20	Provide shade trees adjacent to commercial buildings to reduce building heating/cooling needs.	Applicant	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-21	Commercial uses are to utilize energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners to reduce energy consumption and emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-22	Utilize automatic lighting on/off controls and energy-efficient lighting in new commercial and office construction (including parking areas) to reduce electricity consumption and associated emissions.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.
4.7-23	If possible, use light-colored roofing materials in new commercial and office construction as opposed to dark roofing materials.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Occupancy.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY (cont.)							
4.7-24	Site bus stops at locations to be determined in coordination with the bus transit service provider that will serve the project area.	Applicant	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
				2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation		
4.7-25	Design and implement on-site circulation plans for commercial parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing.	Applicant		1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
				2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation		
4.7-26	If fast-food restaurants are approved for development on the site, improve traffic flow at restaurant drive-through windows by designing separate windows for different functions and by providing temporary parking for orders not immediately ready for pickup.	Applicant		1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
				2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation		
4.7-27	If allowed by the County’s Parking Code, reduce employee parking for those commercial businesses not subject to SCAQMD Rule 2202.	Applicant		1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
				2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation		
4.7-28	Site bus stops at commercial locations to be determined in coordination with the bus transit service provider that will serve the project area.	Applicant	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
				2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning		
				3.	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation		

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.7 AIR QUALITY (cont.)						
4.7-29 Provide on-site truck loading zones within commercial developments.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning	2. LA County Department of Regional Planning	3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
4.7-30 Commercial employers shall provide commuter information areas that contain displays providing information on bus routes and schedules, Metrolink schedules and routes, and the names and numbers for various commercial shuttle services.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning	2. LA County Department of Regional Planning	3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
4.7-31 The commercial centers, which would be greater than 25,000 gross square feet in size, shall comply with the County's <u>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance</u> (Ordinance No. 93-0028M) in effect at the time the map application is deemed complete.	Applicant		1. LA County Department of Regional Planning	2. LA County Department of Regional Planning	3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits and Verify During Project Operation	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.8	WATER RESOURCES				
4.8-1	Prior to recordation of the final tract map, the applicant shall provide to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works a letter from Valencia Water Company which states that VWC will provide water service to the final map area; that the system will be operated by the purveyor; and that, under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division.	Applicant	Written Demonstration of Water Availability	1. LACDPW 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Subdivision Maps	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Map Recordation.</u>
4.8-2	A potable water system with appurtenant facilities to serve all potable water users shall be designed and constructed to the design standards and provisions of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows as determined by the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden.	Applicant	Landscape Plan Review Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permit(s) for the Subdivision	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Occupancy.</u>
4.8-3	Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall pay the applicable connection fee charged to new development by CLWA.	Applicant	Payment of Connection Fees	1. CLWA/VWC 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety CLWA/VWC 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Issuance of Building Permits.</u>

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.8	WATER RESOURCES (cont.)				
4.8-4	Water conservation measures, as required by the State of California, shall be incorporated into building plans for the project. These may include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Health and Safety Code Section 17921.3 which requires low-flush toilets and urinals in all new construction;Title 24, California Administrative Code Sections 2-5352(I) and (j) which require insulation of water-heating systems and pipe insulation to reduce water used before hot water reaches equipment or fixtures; andGovernment Code Section 7800 which specifies that lavatories in all public facilities be equipped with self-closing faucets.	Applicant	Architectural Plans	1. California Department of Conservation 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit(s)	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Issuance of Building Permit(s).</u>
4.8-5	Landscape and irrigation plans for each lot/parcel in VTTM No 52455, with landscape areas greater than 2,500 square feet shall conform to the Los Angeles County Efficient Landscape Ordinance.	Applicant	Landscape Plan Review Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permit(s) for the Subdivision	Landscaping plans to be submitted to LA County by <u> </u> prior to the issuance of <u>Occupancy Permit(s) for the Subdivision.</u>
4.8-6	Major graded slopes adjacent to natural areas shall be landscaped with vegetation that will eventually naturalize and require minimal or no irrigation.	Applicant	Landscape Plan Review Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Building and Safety 2. LACDPW, Building and Safety 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permit(s) for the Subdivision	Landscaping plans to be submitted to LA County by <u> </u> prior to the issuance of <u>Occupancy Permit(s) for the Subdivision.</u>

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency		Status
		Implementing		2. Monitoring Agency		
		Mitigation		3. Monitoring Phase		
4.9	WASTE WATER					
4.9-1	Prior to recordation of the final tract map, a letter shall be obtained from the CSDLAC and provided to LACDPW verifying that there is sufficient capacity in the receiving trunk lines and the Valencia WRP to serve the final map.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. CSDLAC, 2. LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).</u>
4.9-2	The applicant shall pay the applicable CSDLAC connection fees prior to issuance of connection permit(s).	Applicant	Final Plan Check Receipt of Letter Verifying Payment of Fees	1. CSDLAC, LACDPW 2. CSDLAC, LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).</u>
4.9-3	The proposed 10-inch and 21-inch trunk lines are to be designed, constructed, and dedicated to the CSDLAC in accordance with their standards and procedures.	Applicant	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. CSDLAC, LACDPW 2. CSDLAC, LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).</u>
4.9-4	All local sewer lines within the project boundaries are to be designed, constructed, and dedicated to the LACDPW in accordance with its standards and procedures.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Final Plan Check Field Verification	1. CSDLAC, LACDPW 2. CSDLAC, LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps		To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).</u>

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
RWQCB - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.10 SOLIDWASTE DISPOSAL				
4.10-1 Place recycling bins for glass, metals, paper, wood, plastic, greenwastes, and cardboard on construction sites for use by construction workers.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
4.10-2 In construction specification and bid packages, require building materials made of recycled materials, to the extent feasible and economically practical.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
4.10-3 Locate recycling/separation areas in close proximity to dumpsters for non-recyclables, and in elevators, on loading docks, and at primary internal and external access points. (Model Ordinance see discussion under Plans and Policies section)	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
4.10-4 Locate recycling/separation areas so they are not in conflict with any applicable federal, state or local laws relating to fire, building, access, transportation, circulation, or safety.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
4.10-5 Locate recycling/separation areas so they are convenient for those persons who deposit, collect, and load the recyclable materials. (Model Ordinance see discussion under Plans and Policies section)	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
4.10-6 Place recycling containers/bins so that they do not block access to each other.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 2. LACDPW, Waste Management Division 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	Status
				3. Monitoring Phase		
4.10 SOLIDWASTE DISPOSAL (cont.)						
4.10-7	Solid waste collection/recycling areas are to be compatible with nearby structures, secure, protected against adverse environmental conditions, clearly marked, adequate in capacity, number and distribution, and contain a sufficient number of bins, to serve the recycling needs of the development. (Model Ordinance see discussion under Plans and Policies section)	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
				2.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	
				3.	Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	
4.10-8	Design and construct collection/recycling areas to accommodate front-loader packing trucks, including maneuvering room. (Model Ordinance see discussion under Plans and Policies section)	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
				2.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	
				3.	Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	
4.10-9	Design and construct driveways and/or travel aisles with adequate width and maneuverability space for unobstructed garbage collection vehicle access and clearance. (Model Ordinance see discussion under Plans and Policies section)	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
				2.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	
				3.	Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	
4.10-10	Post signs at all access points of the recycling areas that clearly identify all recycling and solid waste collection and loading areas and the materials accepted therein. (Model Ordinance see discussion under Plans and Policies section)	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	Prior to Recordation of Final Map(s).
				2.	LACDPW, Waste Management Division	
				3.	Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.11 POLICE SERVICES				
4.11-1 As final building plans are submitted to the County for approval in the future, County Sheriff's Department design requirements, which would reduce demands for service and ensure adequate public safety, shall be incorporated into building designs, including the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Lighting shall be provided in open areas and parking lots; andThe required building address numbers shall be readily apparent from the street for emergency response agencies.	Applicant	Building Plan Check Field Verification	1. LA County Sheriff's Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Sheriff's Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Final Map Approvals and Verify Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Final Map approval and prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
RWQCBLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.12 FIRE SERVICES AND HAZARDS				
4.12-1 Concurrent with the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay the Los Angeles County Fire Department Developer Fee in effect at that time.	Applicant	Receipt of Letter Verifying Payment of Fees	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, LA County Fire Department 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, LA County Fire Department 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits.
4.12-2 Prior to recordation of a final subdivision map in which urban uses will permanently adjoin a natural area, a Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan as required by Section 1117.2.1 of the County Fire Code shall be prepared and approved by the County Fire Department.	Applicant	Receipt and Review of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Approval of Final Maps	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to approval of Final Maps.
4.12-3 Each final subdivision map for the proposed project shall provide sufficient capacity for fire flows of 1,250 gallons per minute (gpm) at 20 pounds per square inch (psi) residual pressure for a two hour duration for single family residential units, and 5,000 gpm at 20 psi residual pressure for a 5-hour duration for multi-family residential units and commercial/retail uses with a floor plan in excess of 35,000 square feet, or such other fire flow required by the County Fire Department.	Applicant	Field Verification of Required Fire Flows	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits.
4.12-4 Prior to framing, site access shall be provided to comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code which requires all weather access.	Applicant	Field Verification	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	To be addressed at a later date. Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.12	FIRE SERVICES AND HAZARDS (cont.)				
4.12-5	Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants.	Applicant	Field Verification	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits. To be addressed at a later date.
4.12-6	Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, development shall comply with County Building and Safety and Fire Code requirements associated with the provision of adequate site vehicular access (County Fire Code 10.207), and fire prevention and suppression.	Applicant	Receipt of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan Field Verification	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits. To be addressed at a later date.
4.12-7	Prior to recordation of final subdivision map(s) the project shall satisfy all conditions of approval for Tentative Subdivision Map 52455 relating to the provision of vehicular and Fire Department access.	Applicant	Receipt of Wildfire Fuel Modification Plan Field Verification	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Map Recordation	To be addressed at a later date. <u>Prior to Map Recordation.</u>
4.12-8	The applicant shall install Fire Department-approved street signs and building numbers prior to issuance of occupancy permits.	Applicant	Field Verification	1. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 2. LA County Fire Department, LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits	Prior to Issuance of Occupancy Permits. To be addressed at a later date.

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.13 LIBRARY SERVICES				
4.13-1 The applicant shall pay the permanent library fee (\$569.87 per new residential unit) to the County Library to offset the demand for library items and building square-footage generated by the proposed project. The library mitigation payment shall be made on a building permit by building permit basis. This per unit mitigation fee of \$569.87.00 would generate a maximum total of \$1,450,319.10 in library fees if all units proposed were built, and would fund new library space and materials which would be needed to serve the project.	Applicant	Letter Verifying Payment of Fees	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, LA County Department of Libraries, LACDPW 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, LA County Department of Libraries, LACDPW 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status	
4.14 PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS							
4.14-1 The applicant shall pay the in lieu parkland fee established by the County Parkland Dedication Ordinance in effect at the time of Map recordation. Payment of this fee will cover the projected 1.47-acre shortfall in parkland associated with the proposed project. Presently this fee stands at \$129,000.00 for Park Planning Area 35C, which equates to an in lieu fee of \$189,630.00.	Applicant	Letter Verifying Payment of Fees	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, LA County Department of Parks and Recreation		<u>Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.	
			2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, LA County Department of Parks and Recreation			
			3.	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits			

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.17 ENVIRONMENTAL AND MANMADE HAZARDS				
4.17-1 Only non-habitable structures shall be located within SCE easements.	Applicant (Project Engineer)	Final Plan Check	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning, LACDPW 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning, LACDPW 3. Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	<u>Prior to Map Recordation.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.17-2 Provide a disclosure statement on the title to each residential lot informing prospective purchasers of the existence of EMFs.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1. LA County Building and Safety Department, 2. LA County Building and Safety Department 3. Prior to Issuance of Building Permit	<u>Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.17-3 Wells on the property shall be abandoned in compliance with the requirements of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas. If any undocumented oil wells are encountered during grading operations, the casing shall be immediately surveyed for locations and inspected by the Division of Oil and Gas, for leaks.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Grading Plans	All known wells have been properly abandoned. Refer to Appendix D. Ongoing during grading and site preparation phases.
4.17-4 In accordance with provisions of the Los Angeles County Building Code, all buildings and enclosed structures that would be constructed within the site and located within 25 feet of oil or gas wells shall be provided with methane gas protection systems. Buildings located between 25 and 200 feet of oil or gas wells shall, prior to issuance of building permits by the County of Los Angeles, be evaluated in accordance with the current rules and regulations of the California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil and Gas.	Applicant (Geotechnical Engineer)	Grading Plan Check Field Verification	1. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 2. LACDPW, Geology/Soils Section 3. Prior to Approval of Grading Plans	All known wells have been properly abandoned. Refer to Appendix D.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval		Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency	2. Monitoring Agency	3. Monitoring Phase	Status			
4.18 UTILITIES SERVICES										
4.18-1	Prior to the recordation of the final tract map, the applicant shall provide to the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works a letter from both the Southern California Edison Company and the Southern California Gas Company indicating their ability to provide energy to the project.	Applicant	Final Plan Check	1.	LACDPW, LA County Department of Regional Planning	2.	LACDPW, LA County Department of Regional Planning	3.	Prior to Recordation of Final Maps	<u>Prior to Map Recordation.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.18-2	Structures in the proposed development shall be required to meet the Energy Building Regulations adopted by the California Energy Commission (Title 24). Meeting these specifications would conserve non-renewable natural resources to levels acceptable to the State of California.	Applicant	Building Plan Check	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, LACDPW	2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, LACDPW	3.	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.18-3	The applicant shall comply with guidelines provided by the SCE in regard to easement restrictions, construction guidelines, and potential amendments to right-of-way in the areas of any existing Edison Company easements.	Applicant	Building Plan Check	1.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, LACDPW	2.	LA County Department of Regional Planning, LACDPW	3.	Prior to Issuance of Building Permits	<u>Prior to the Issuance of Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
FCD - Flood Control Division
LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
RWQCBAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District

Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval	Party Responsible for Implementing Mitigation	Monitoring Action	1. Enforcement Agency 2. Monitoring Agency 3. Monitoring Phase	Status
4.19 EDUCATION				
4.19-1 The applicant shall comply with the terms of the Saugus Funding Agreement. As stated above, the Agreement between the project applicant and the Saugus District will provide for full mitigation of the project's impact on schools in both the Saugus and Castaic Districts. The Agreement provides for school facilities meeting State standards to be constructed in time to serve the students generated by the project. Therefore, adoption of a mitigation measure requiring compliance with the Saugus Funding Agreement would reduce such impacts to a level of insignificance.	Applicant	Receipt of Executed Agreement and Letter Verifying Payment of Fees	1. Saugus Union School District 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Residential Building Permits	<u>Prior to the Issuance of Residential Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
4.19-2 The applicant shall comply with the terms of the Hart Funding Agreement. As stated above, the Agreement between the project applicant and the Hart District will provide for full mitigation of the project's impact on schools in the Hart District. The Agreement provides for school facilities meeting State standards to be constructed in time to serve the students generated by the project. Therefore, adoption of a mitigation measure requiring compliance with the Hart Funding Agreement would reduce such impacts to a level of insignificance.	Applicant	Receipt of Executed Agreement and Letter Verifying Payment of Fees	1. William S. Hart Union High School District 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. Prior to Issuance of Residential Building Permits	<u>Prior to the Issuance of Residential Building Permits.</u> To be addressed at a later date.
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST RESOURCES				
A Los Angeles County Natural History Museum-approved inspector is to be on site during an appropriate number of excavations into the Saugus formation. Should the excavations yield significant paleontological resources, excavation shall be stopped or redirected until the extent of this find is established and the resources salvaged.	Applicant (Construction Superintendent)	Field Verification	1. LA County Department of Regional Planning 2. LA County Department of Regional Planning 3. During Grading Activity	<u>During Site Grading.</u>

CSDLAC - County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
 FCD - Flood Control Division
 LACDPW - Los Angeles County Department of Public Works
 LACFPD - Los Angeles County Fire Protection District

LAFCO - Local Agency Formation Commission
 RWQCBLLAR - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
 SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
 WSHUHSD - William S. Hart Union High School District